Exhibit E

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 1 2 FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON 3 FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION, et al., 4 Plaintiffs, Case No. 3:24-cv-00347-AN 5 v. 6 August 26, 2024 THE KROGER COMPANY and 7 ALBERTSONS COMPANIES, INC., Defendants. Portland, Oregon 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION HEARING 15 DAY 1 - MORNING SESSION 16 TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS 17 BEFORE THE HONORABLE ADRIENNE NELSON 18 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT JUDGE 19 20 21 22 23 24 25

1 **APPEARANCES** 2 FOR PLAINTIFF FEDERAL 3 TRADE COMMISSION: Ms. Susan Musser Mr. Charles Dickinson 4 Federal Trade Commission 5 400 7th Street S.W. Washington, DC 20024 6 Mr. Rohan Pai 7 Ms. Laura Hall Mr. Barrett James Anderson 8 Federal Trade Commission 600 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W. 9 Washington, DC 20580 10 11 12 FOR PLAINTIFF STATE Ms. Jayme L. Weber OF ARIZONA: Office of the Arizona Attorney General 13 400 W. Congress Street, Suite S-215 Tucson, AZ 85701 14 15 FOR PLAINTIFF STATE 16 OF CALIFORNIA: Ms. Nicole Gordon Office of the California Attorney 17 General 455 Golden Gate Avenue, Suite 11000 18 San Francisco, CA 94102 19 20 FOR PLAINTIFF DISTRICT Ms. Estefania Yulianny Torres Paez OF COLUMBIA: 21 Office of Attorney General for the District of Columbia 400 6th Street N.W., 10th Floor 22 Washington, DC 20001 23 24 25

1	FOR PLAINTIFF STATE	Mar Daday Wash
2	OF ILLINOIS:	Mr. Brian Yost Mr. Paul Harper Office of the Illinois Attorney Conord
3		Office of the Illinois Attorney General 115 S. LaSalle Street Chicago, IL 60603
4		Clitcago, in 60603
5	FOR PLAINTIFF STATE OF MARYLAND:	Mr. Byron Warren
6	OF PHILIPAND.	Office of the Maryland Attorney General 200 St. Paul Place
7		Baltimore, MD 21202
8		
9	FOR PLAINTIFF STATE OF NEVADA:	Mr. Lucas J. Tucker
10		Nevada Attorney General's Office 8945 W. Russell Road, Suite 204
11		Las Vegas, NV 89148
12	FOR PLAINTIFF STATE OF NEW MEXICO:	Mr. Jeff Dan Herrera
13		New Mexico Office of the Attorney General
14 15		Consumer Protection Division 408 Galisteo Street Sante Fe, NM 87501
16	FOR PLAINTIFF STATE	Salice 10, Ini 0,301
17	OF OREGON:	Mr. Christopher J. Kayser Larkins Vacura Kayser LLP
18		121 S.W. Morrison Street, Suite 700 Portland, OR 97204
19		Mr. Tim D. Nord Oregon Department of Justice
20		Civil Enforcement 1162 Court Street NE
21		Salem, OR 97301
22		
23	FOR PLAINTIFF STATE OF WYOMING:	Mr. William Talley Young
24		109 State Capitol Cheyenne, WY 82002
25		

1 FOR DEFENDANT KROGER COMPANY: Mr. B. John Casey 2 Stoel Rives LLP 760 S.W. Ninth Avenue, Suite 3000 3 Portland, OR 97205 Mr. Bambo Obaro 4 Weil, Gotshal & Manges LLP 5 201 Redwood Shores Parkway Redwood Shores, CA 94065 6 Ms. Luna Ngan Barrington Weil, Gotshal & Manges LLP 7 767 Fifth Avenue 8 New York, NY 10153 Mr. Matthew M. Wolf 9 Ms. Sonia Kuester Pfaffenroth Mr. Christian Schultz 10 Mr. Joshua Davis Arnold & Porter Kaye Scholer LLP 11 601 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W. 12 Washington, DC 20001 13 Mr. Mark Andrew Perry Weil, Gotshal & Manges 2001 M Street NW, Suite 600 14 Washington, DC 20036 15 Ms. Christine Wheatley 16 Kroger General Counsel 17 The Kroger Company 1014 Vine Street Cincinnati, OH 45202 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25

1	FOR DEFENDANT ALBERTSONS COMPANIES	
2	INC.:	Mr. David H. Angeli Angeli Law Group LLC
3		121 S.W. Morrison Street, Suite 400 Portland, OR 97204
4		
5		Ms. Enu Mainigi Mr. Jonathan Bradley Pitt
6		Mr. Adam Joshua Podoll Ms. Beth A. Stewart
7		Mr. Michael Cowie Mr. Tyler Infinger
8		Ms. Adwea Seymour Mr. Thomas Moriarty
9		Williams & Connolly 680 Maine Avenue S.W.
10		Washington, DC 20024
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19	COURT REPORTER:	Jill L. Jessup, CSR, RMR, RDR, CRR, CRC United States District Courthouse
20		1000 S.W. Third Avenue, Room 301 Portland, OR 97204
21		jill_jessup@ord.uscourts.gov
22		
23		
24		
25		
	1	

PAGE:
33
83
123

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

(August 26, 2024)

(In open court:)

DEPUTY COURTROOM CLERK: All rise.

THE COURT: Please be seated. Good morning.

So we are here in the matter of Federal Trade

Commission, et al. v. The Kroger Company and Albertsons

Companies, Incorporated. Case No. 3:24-cv-00347. This is

the first day of a three-week preliminary hearing, an

injunction, to determine what will happen with the proposed

merger that has clearly gotten a lot of attention because of

the large number of people that I have sitting in my

courtroom.

I trust that everyone has received a copy of the courtroom management and decorum order. Just to reiterate, there will not be any beverages or food allowed. That does not include water. I will allow you to have water in here.

You cannot have any type of electronic devices. If someone somehow does possess one and they're sitting in the gallery, you will be removed and not be able to attend the hearing for the entirety of it. This is your warning.

If counsel will state their appearances for the record while I log on to my device, we'll begin with the pretrial matters that we are continuing to address from Friday's pretrial hearing.

```
1
              MS. MUSSER: Good morning, Your Honor.
    Susan Musser on behalf of the Federal Trade Commission, and
 2
 3
    I'll let my co-counsel introduce themselves.
              THE COURT: Absolutely.
 4
 5
              MS. HALL: Laura Hall on behalf of the Federal
 6
    Trade Commission.
 7
              MR. DICKINSON: Good morning, Your Honor.
    Charles Dickinson from the Federal Trade Commission.
 8
 9
              MR. PAI: Good morning, Your Honor, Rohan Pai on
    behalf of the Federal Trade Commission.
10
              MR. ANDERSON: Barrett Anderson for the FTC.
11
12
              MR. KAYSER: Chris Kayser on behalf of the State
13
    of Oregon. And with me today I have Tim Nord from the
14
    Oregon Department of Justice.
15
              MR. NORD:
                         Good morning.
16
              THE COURT: Good morning.
17
              MR. HERRERA: Good morning, Your Honor,
18
    Jeff Herrera on behalf of the plaintiff, State of New
    Mexico.
19
20
              MR. YOUNG: Good morning, Your Honor. William
21
    Young on behalf of the State of Wyoming.
22
              MR. TUCKER: Good morning, Your Honor.
    Lucas Tucker on behalf of the State of Nevada.
23
24
              MS. TORRES PAEZ: Good morning, Your Honor.
25
    Estefania Torres Paez for the District of Columbia.
```

```
1
              MS. GORDON: Good morning, Your Honor.
 2
    Nicole Gordon for the State of California.
 3
              MR. WARREN: Good morning, Your Honor.
    Byron Warren for the State of Maryland.
 4
 5
              THE COURT: Good morning.
 6
              MS. WEBER: Good morning, Your Honor. Jamie Weber
    for the State of Arizona.
 7
              MR. WOLF: Good morning, Your Honor.
                                                     Matt Wolf
 8
 9
    from Arnold & Porter for Kroger. With me, from Arnold &
    Porter, is Sonia Pfaffenroth, Christian Schultz, Josh Davis.
10
    From Stoel, John Casey. From a client, Christine Wheatley,
11
12
    General Counsel.
13
              THE COURT: Yes. We saw her in July.
14
              MR. WOLF: And Yael Cosset, our Chief Information
    Officer, in the gallery.
15
16
         And from Weil Gotshal, Mark Perry.
17
              MR. PERRY: Good morning.
18
              THE COURT: Good morning.
              MR. WOLF: Bambo Obaro.
19
20
              MR. OBARO: Good morning.
21
              THE COURT: Good morning.
22
              MR. WOLF: And Luna Barrington.
23
              THE COURT: Good morning.
24
              MS. MAINIGI: Good morning, Your Honor.
25
    Enu Mainigi from Willams & Connolly for Albertsons.
```

```
from Williams & Connolly are Beth Stewart, Joshua Podoll,
 1
 2
    Jonathan Pitt, and Tyler Infinger.
         From Dechert, Mike Cowie.
 3
               THE COURT: Good morning.
 4
 5
               MS. MAINIGI: And from the Angeli Law Group,
 6
    David Angeli.
 7
               THE COURT: Yes.
              MS. MAINIGI: And, Your Honor, from the client, we
 8
    have Tom Moriarty, General Counsel.
 9
10
               MR. MORIARTY: Good morning, Your Honor.
11
               THE COURT: Yes, good morning.
              MS. MAINIGI: Adwea Seymour, head of litigation;
12
13
    and we also have Mr. Vivek Sankaran, CEO; as well as
    Ms. Susan Morris, COO of Albertsons.
14
15
               THE COURT: All right.
16
              MS. MAINIGI: Thank you.
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

1 THE COURT: I know you have been working over the 2 weekend. We had talked about your working to try to confer around a number of issues. So if you can update the Court. 3 MS. MUSSER: Thank you, Your Honor. From -- on 4 5 behalf of plaintiffs, Mr. Anderson and Ms. Hall are going to 6 provide updates which I think will please this Court. We 7 have been able to resolve or at least narrow many of the 8 issues. 9 MR. ANDERSON: Good morning, Your Honor. 10 Barrett Anderson. As my colleague indicated, we have, I 11 hope, mostly good news here. 12 A couple of the issues that were left on the table, the 13 first one was the briefing by the parties on the scope of the administrative record. 14 15 THE COURT: Yes. MR. ANDERSON: I'm pleased to say the parties have 16 17 reached agreement. We'll be filing a joint stipulation and 18 order later today. THE COURT: All right. And I look forward to 19 20 receiving it. I hope --21 MR. ANDERSON: Yes, Your Honor. 22 THE COURT: -- to be able to sign off on it later 23 tonight. I too will be working around the clock, as are all 24 of the attorneys, because that's just the nature of 25 litigation, but it will happen as soon as possible.

MR. ANDERSON: Thank you, Your Honor. I can tell you that it contemplates the parties filing things at the end of the hearing, so no rush on that.

THE COURT: All right. Fair enough.

MR. ANDERSON: The parties also discussed a variety of other issues. We've reached agreement on disclosures of exhibits for direct examinations and demonstratives, and we're going to continue to meet and confer regularly on exhibits.

THE COURT: Great.

MR. ANDERSON: With respect to confidentiality, which I know was front and center, we also have had productive conversations on that over the weekend of the scope of the defendants' confidentiality designations.

Based on the guidance that we received over the weekend from the defendants, we believe there is a path forward here for the parties to continue to work together.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. ANDERSON: That will both protect the truly confidential information while allowing plaintiffs to openly discuss a broader scope of information than what defendants had originally designated.

So our understanding, just so the Court is aware, is that, consistent with what counsel for Kroger represented on Friday at the prehearing conference, defendants are most

concerned with the specific numbers, the data, like prices 1 2 and margins. We can work with that sort of information, 3 along with the disclosure process, and the continued meet-and-confers, we expect that we'll be able to present 4 5 most of our case without issue. Of course working with 6 Your Honor to remove any documents that should not be displayed at the right time and otherwise arranging our 7 8 examinations and the courtroom appropriately. 9

With that in mind and with the idea that we'll continue to work together, we don't believe there's reason for the Court to rule on the defendants' motions to seal today.

THE COURT: All right.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. ANDERSON: Instead, recommend deferring ruling on that.

THE COURT: Fair enough.

MR. ANDERSON: I'll pause there in case defendants have anything to say, and I have one more issue after that, Your Honor.

MR. OBARO: Good morning, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Good morning.

MR. OBARO: Bambo Obaro, with Weil Gotchal, from Kroger. We agree with the characterization from the FTC about the nature of the conversations. With respect to the confidentiality designations, as the FTC noted, we intend to continue to work with them the day before -- before trial to

make sure that we're aligned on what needs to be sealed. We do not intend to seal the courtroom and plan to work cooperatively with them. That's the agreement that we have.

There's an issue that we want to discuss with respect to the exhibits, and my colleague Josh Podoll will discuss that issue with the Court.

MR. PODOLL: Yes, Your Honor. As Mr. Anderson said and Mr. Obaro said, we reached agreement on the vast majority of the issues.

The one sort of outstanding issue is -- revolves around cross-examination exhibits, which is to say not rebuttal or impeachment, but a document that either side affirmatively intends to admit through cross-examination.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. PODOLL: The defense's proposal as to those documents is that, like direct exhibits, they should be shared 48 hours in advance. The idea is that those documents, no less than direct exhibits, have confidentiality issues. There may be evidentiary issues.

I understand every lawyer wants to protect the secret sauce of cross-examination, but the reality is there aren't secrets at this point in this case. We've been through extensive discovery. The record is well-known. So we think the most efficient path forward would be for any document that's going to be admitted. Be it on cross or be it on

direct, that document should be part of the regular 1 2 disclosure of exhibits. THE COURT: So what was the agreement? 3 MR. PODOLL: The agreement is that exhibits that 4 will be used on direct with a witness will be disclosed 48 5 6 hours in advance. 7 THE COURT: Okay. MR. PODOLL: And given to Your Honor, and the 8 9 parties will meet and confer and bring in any issues on confidentiality or any evidentiary issues to you in advance. 10 11 The defense's proposal is to do the same thing with 12 cross-examination exhibits too, not just direct exhibits. My understanding is the Government would limit the 13 14 agreement to sharing the direct exhibits. How would that work in terms of the 15 THE COURT: timing of the witnesses, in terms of -- because if you -- if 16 you're not -- it can affect how quickly you can do 17 18 cross-examination, it seems like. 19 MR. PODOLL: Yes. Our position is that it would 20 be most efficient and would --I understand that, but I'm just trying 21 THE COURT: to understand timing of witnesses. Because I also am 22 acknowledging that based on what was just shared as who's in 23 24 the courtroom, we have three witnesses here, and I'm not

sure witnesses are supposed to be present.

25

MS. MAINIGI: Your Honor, I believe the executives from the companies are here just for opening statements, and then they're intending to depart.

THE COURT: I see. Good. I just wanted to raise that. I know there are a lot of moving parts, and I have been trying to manage them all, and I'm trying to make sure nothing gets past me, and that's why I'm raising it, because I didn't want that to get past me. Fair enough.

Government's response?

MR. ANDERSON: Yes, Your Honor, two points. One is, as my colleague Mr. Podoll indicated, sharing cross-examination exhibits -- it's very unusual -- in advance. Cross-examination is, by definition, flexible. And, Your Honor, at this point there could be issues where we have planned cross-examination. It may not even come up because it doesn't come up on direct.

And, Your Honor, the last issue -- the concern about confidentiality, we expect that, through the course of the next few days and this week, we're going to better understand even what the guardrails are with respect to confidentiality. There's likely not going to be a lot of necessity to review specific exhibits as we get further into the case when cross-examinations from the Federal Government actually proceed.

THE COURT: All right. Go ahead.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. PODOLL: I think, Your Honor, it's really just an efficiency point. We appreciate -- I appreciate what Mr. Anderson says. I don't really disagree with it. We just think that, given the limited time we have, the more we can do to streamline the operation, the better. And by the way, we would be giving to the Government, under our proposal, any documents we would use on cross-examination during their case. THE COURT: I believe that, for efficiency, I think you all have done an incredible amount of work to try and meet the requests of the Court, but I'm not going to interfere with your ability to try your case. So I'm not going to include cross-examination exhibits at this point. MR. PODOLL: Thank you. MR. ANDERSON: Yes, Your Honor. One last issue before --THE COURT: Did they have another? MR. ANDERSON: No. THE COURT: Go ahead. MR. ANDERSON: The last issue is, Your Honor, we did receive the Court's ruling with respect to Dr. Israel's surrebuttal report, the motion to strike. THE COURT: Yes. MR. ANDERSON: I just wanted to make sure that we

were forthright as well. Plaintiffs -- we do intend to call

our expert, Dr. Hill, during our case-in-chief, but at this point Dr. Hill would not plan to affirmatively address Dr. Israel's new analysis. That came up in that surrebuttal in our case-in-chief. At most, if he comes up to address it, Dr. Hill would do so during our rebuttal case.

So to the extent that Dr. Hill, our expert, prepares a surreply to the new analysis -- and I realize there's a lot going on here, Your Honor, but to the extent he does that, we would disclose that surreply 48 hours in advance of Dr. Israel's testimony during defendants' case-in-chief.

MR. WOLF: We have no objection to that procedure, Your Honor.

THE COURT: That will happen.

MR. ANDERSON: Now I hand it to my colleague Laura Hall.

THE COURT: All right. No? Oh, okay.

MS. HALL: Your Honor, pursuant to your direction on Friday, we met and conferred with counsel for C&S on the -- on Saturday regarding their motion to seal. It was a very productive discussion and resulted in C&S providing narrowed redactions for a number of documents and deposition transcripts, but we have two areas where we have reached an impasse that we'd like Your Honor's guidance on, and they're related. They are both related to the concept of rebannering, which you're going to hear a lot about, which

is, at bottom, changing the name of the store. 1 2 THE COURT: Right. MS. HALL: And so in preparation for operating the 3 divested stores, C&S's commissioned studies of different 4 5 consumer perceptions of different brands that they have 6 available to them, and they are taking the position that some of the reports they received on consumer perception are 7 8 competitively sensitive and they want it to be sealed. If Your Honor would like, I can hand up a document 9 10 that's an example of that. THE COURT: Was it not already provided? 11 12 MS. HALL: It was. It's just, I believe, counsel referred to 7,000 pages arriving. 13 14 THE COURT: All right. You can't --15 MS. HALL: Like a one-page --16 THE COURT: You can -- you may approach. Absolutely. 17 This is a page from PX3406. 18 MS. HALL: page 8, and the green highlighted area is discussing 19 20 consumer perceptions of certain brands that C&S would be acquiring in the divestiture. 21 Our view is that this is not confidential information 22 of C&S. C&S doesn't own these banners. It didn't do any of 23 24 the work that resulted in consumer perceptions of these 25 banners. And even if they did own the banners, this is

about the public perception. This is not internal, confidential, or proprietary information.

I can stop here for C&S to respond on this issue, or I can raise the related issue, whichever would be more effective -- efficient for you.

THE COURT: Are they interrelated, or are they separate?

MS. HALL: The other issue is also about rebannering and which stores C&S plans to rebanner to particular acquired banners.

THE COURT: You can go ahead and address it.

MS. HALL: Okay. So currently there is what I understand to be tentative plans to rebanner the divestiture stores to particular acquired banners in particular regions.

And I also can hand up an example of this, Your Honor, which is from DX2905 at slide 49.

So this is a little hard to see at this scale, but this shows the originating banner on the left and then a description of an interim -- a potential interim state, and then on the right a sort of destination banner they're currently planning for particular stores in particular states.

And we think that this is important to assess because whether the particular destination banner, if you will, we believe will affect the likelihood of success of those

stores being competitive.

For example, if it's a better known brand or similar to the current brand, it is more likely to be accepted by consumers. If it's totally unknown, if it's a very different format and assortment, that's a riskier choice.

So we don't think this is competitively sensitive. We understand that it's currently confidential, but the options are known because the press releases state which banners they're getting, either in whole or licensed in certain jurisdictions, and we don't understand how the plan to use a particular jurisdiction in a particular region is competitively sensitive.

THE COURT: So let me make sure that I'm understanding. You, on Friday, were wanting to mention this in your opening statements.

MS. HALL: Yes.

THE COURT: I don't think that's necessary.

MS. HALL: I have edited my opening statement already, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. I don't think it's necessary.

MS. HALL: All right. But we would like the ability to explore it with our expert, Dr. Fox, as well as with C&S's witnesses later this week.

THE COURT: Oh, absolutely.

1 MS. HALL: Since we were at an impasse, we wanted 2 to bring it to you today. 3 THE COURT: Understood. MR. PERRY: Your Honor, Mark Perry for Kroger. 4 5 I'm not here to argue that point but rather to 6 introduce Renata Hesse for C&S. And while she comes up, 7 it's very crowded today for openings. We may come back at 8 the next break to discuss whether C&S may have a place 9 somewhere in the courtroom with electronics since they will 10 be here for the entirety of the trial. 11 THE COURT: I wondered if they were. I know they 12 had local counsel here on Friday. International counsel will be here for 13 MR. PERRY: 14 the entire trial, but I don't think we have to do that right I just wanted to alert the Court to that issue. 15 now. 16 THE COURT: You see we're pretty tight. We have 17 to figure some things out because -- we may have to bring in 18 some less-than-comfortable chairs to make people -- to make 19 space. Your Honor, my prediction is perhaps 20 MR. PERRY: 21 this afternoon or tomorrow there might not be quite as many 22 people. 23 THE COURT: Oh, all right. 24 MR. PERRY: Ms. Hesse.

MS. HESSE: Good morning, Your Honor.

25

THE COURT: Good morning.

MS. HESSE: Renata Hesse for C&S from

Sullivan & Cromwell.

On the rebannering issue, the key point here for our client is that -- what it is thinking about where it will be rebannering and which banners it will use in which jurisdiction is not public at the moment and is confidential, and they feel that it is competitively sensitive in the sense that, when it goes out into the marketplace, assuming that it does acquire these stores ultimately, what it will be doing, which banners it will be picking, what the public perception of those banners are, based on a confidential study commission on C&S, is something our competitors, including Kroger, would find valuable because it will allow them to figure out how to better attack us in competition.

So we think it is competitively sensitive. We don't believe that it's necessary for the FTC to be able to describe our -- these plans in detail. We have told them that it's fine for them to ask our witnesses about which banners are known where and which banners could potentially be used in other places, but we don't think it's appropriate for them to question our witnesses or make public information about where C&S plans to use particular banners, particularly when that is still an unsettled question for

C&S.

THE COURT: Did you create this information -- how was this -- let me start over.

The question is how was this information gathered, and why do you feel it's confidential?

MS. HESSE: So there are two different sets of information. One -- the first example that Ms. Hall gave you is a portion of a study that we -- that we commissioned --

THE COURT: Okay.

MS. HESSE: -- regarding the banners and perception of banners.

And that was important for us to do because we wanted to figure out what people thought about the banners so we could figure out where we might use them.

The second is -- I believe is a piece of our business plan, and so that is a confidential document where we go through -- and it's an example of what we're thinking about where we might use particular banners and what the approach to rebannering might be.

So that's a -- that is a confidential internal document that's an active business plan that is -- that C&S is working.

THE COURT: Are you opposed that you would acknowledge that you went through these two efforts to

```
determine the viability of taking on this project?
 1
 2
              MS. HESSE:
                          Not at all.
              THE COURT: It's the details.
 3
              MS. HESSE: It's the details.
 4
              THE COURT: The locations?
 5
              MS. HESSE: Yes.
 6
 7
              THE COURT: You're saying it's fluid? My word,
    not your word.
 8
                          It is fluid at the moment. We're
 9
              MS. HESSE:
10
    still actively working on determining where we will use
    particular banners and how those will be rolled out and over
11
12
    what timeline.
                   That is fluid. We have no objection to the
13
    FTC asking our witnesses about the banners and where they
14
    are and anything like that.
15
              THE COURT: Fair enough.
                                         Thank you.
16
              MS. HALL: I have nothing further.
17
              THE COURT: All right.
18
              MS. HALL: On that issue, yeah.
19
              THE COURT: I'm going to allow limited questions,
20
    but I'm not going to allow the specifics.
21
         If we don't know for sure, I don't want to put them in
22
    a disadvantage at this point.
23
              MS. HESSE: Thank you, Your Honor.
24
              THE COURT: You're welcome.
25
              MS. HALL: Ms. Hesse, you may want to stay up for
```

a second.

One other issue arose unexpectedly on Friday afternoon when we received a new amended errata for Ms. Florenz, who is a C&S executive and on plaintiffs' witness list. We believe the delivery of errata two and a half months after her deposition was inappropriate. We can address that with the court now or we can address it during lunch so we don't delay opening.

THE COURT: Let's have you discuss it over lunch, and if you need to, let me know and we can come back a little early.

MS. HALL: Oh, I think we need to discuss it with the Court. We have met and conferred on the issue.

THE COURT: Let's talk about it.

MS. HALL: Now, Your Honor?

THE COURT: Yes.

MS. HALL: Okay. So Ms. Florenz testified on June 6th as the corporate representative on a number of topics, including the treatment of certain customer data in the divestiture purchase agreement, and she testified that she had personal knowledge of that provision, that she had met with counsel the prior day to prepare for her deposition, and she was represented by counsel during her deposition.

Her testimony about that provision was consistent with

the plaintiffs' understanding of the provisions of the divestiture purchase agreement.

She served errata on July 9th, which did not address this particular page, page 163, of her deposition -- and I can hand up the errata in question if it would be of assistance. Basically, the errata that we received at 4:15 p.m. the last business day before trial completely reverses Ms. Florenz's testimony about the meaning of the contract provision. We believe that violates controlling Ninth Circuit case law, which is Hambleton Bros. Lumber v. Balkin Enterprises, Inc., 397 F.3d 1217 at 1225. Ninth Circuit, 2005, which requires substantial compliance with the 30-day deadline in the Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 30(e) governing errata.

Ms. Florenz's July 9th errata includes items on pages 162 and 168. So bracketing the page in question. The amended errata was accompanied by a cover letter stating that they had only discovered her testimony was incorrect in the course of preparing her to testify for trial.

And, Your Honor, we have no objection to her testifying consistent with her current understanding of the provisions, but giving effect to this errata would mean that we cannot confront her with her prior inconsistent statement, and so we think that that's unfair.

Our other concern is that defendants' expert,

Mr. Galante, includes in his report an observation about the same provision of the divestiture purchase agreement.

We ask C&S whether they had conferred with defendants on their understanding of this provision. They said yes. So we now have a concern that Mr. Galante's report may also be amended to change the interpretation given there.

So we are prejudiced by the belated disclosure of this position. We know that the CEO of C&S, Mr. Winn, testified in his personal capacity to a different understanding, but we relied on the corporate representative's testimony up until Friday afternoon, and so we just ask that this errata be stricken so that we can confront Ms. Florenz with her prior inconsistent statement under oath.

MS. HESSE: Your Honor, I think we were really trying to do plaintiffs a favor here by letting them know that the understanding of the contract terms that

Ms. Florenz articulated was incomplete. I would not say it was incorrect. And that Mr. Winn's testimony on this same issue was, in fact, more -- had more detail and was therefore complete.

But what's -- the issue here is the meaning of "customer data." That's the -- the key issue, and the question is how -- how long and whether Kroger can retain customer data after the close of the transition period. So after the TSA, the transition services agreement, concludes.

We think we and Kroger have the exact same view on this provision and the transition services agreement, and that is that for customer data relating to customer demographics, Kroger is able to retain that information after the close of the transition period; so after day one starts. But for the transaction data that Kroger collects during the transition -- transition period, that data, consistent with Mr. Winn's testimony, must be deleted.

The other issue that I think was somewhat confusing in Ms. Florenz's testimony is that if you look at the complete passage of the -- of the testimony, I believe what she was talking about was about what would happen during the transition period because she was asked immediately after the part of the testimony that the FTC is quoting, doesn't she have concerns that she would -- that Kroger would be able to use this data, and she said, "No. Because everything would be regular or go back to regular business practices on day one."

So I don't think that there's -- I think this is a little bit of a tempest in a teapot. They're free to ask Ms. Florenz whatever they would like to ask her, but I think the contract says what it says. The parties interpret it the way they interpret it. We interpret it consistent with the way the parties interpret it, and allow Mr. Perry to talk about the potential inconsistency with Dr. Galante.

MR. PERRY: Thank you, Your Honor. Mark Perry for Kroger. We were not notified of this issue by the FTC, but C&S did tell us about it.

The contract provision -- the Court's going to hear a lot more about this later, and this is, I don't think, a today issue, by the way, but the transition services agreement, the Court will hear a great deal about. It's a very extensive negotiated document that goes with the asset purchase agreement. They're two combined documents, and you will hear testimony, lay and expert, about it.

This particular issue relates to a provision of the APA, Section 7.7 (B)(3)(iii) that deals with the use and retention, and so forth, of certain data.

The provision means what it says, is Kroger's position, defendants' position, to be clear, and the witnesses may of course be questioned about it.

Mr. Galante, our expert -- and by the way, Your Honor. If I could detour. We do have three experts today in the witness box; as you were looking around the courtroom, I'm sure the Court was curious as to who it is.

THE COURT: Well, I recognize Dr. Israel.

MR. PERRY: Dr. Israel on the left; Mr. Galante, who we're speaking about, in the middle, which is why I would mention it; and Mr. Roger King on the right --

THE COURT: Good morning.

MR. PERRY: -- who you heard about on Friday.

So Mr. Galante does not intend to amend his report on this issue, Your Honor, to the extent the Government raised that issue, and as Ms. Hesse said, the witness has clarified her testimony. I think that's -- the Court should have the most complete and accurate representation from witnesses as to their understanding of the facts.

Thank you.

MS. HALL: Well, thank you very much. I'm very glad to hear about Mr. Galante.

We weren't sure whether to contact Kroger on this. I had heard from Mr. Wolf on Friday. "Leave us out of it. Go deal with C&S. We've got enough to do."

So I thought I was sparing you folks from yet another thing to do over the weekend.

We have no objection to Ms. Florenz testifying in whatever manner she believes is consistent with the contract. We object only to errata that purports to change what she said two and a half months ago, and that is all we ask, is that that errata be stricken.

THE COURT: It will be stricken. Understanding

Hambleton Bros. Lumber Company and its holding, I -- I

have -- that that's my ruling.

So I know you know that we didn't start right at 9:00. So I want us to have a truncated lunch just so that we can

1 stay on track. I am sure with all of the changes that I see 2 in my courtroom, and I know that we had a printer installed 3 at some point on Friday. That's what you told me. I'm assuming that it happened. We may be able to make up our 4 5 time. Because I would rather us truncate today than trying 6 to push in other days. Because I am sure there are a lot of 7 people who've made plans to leave the city on 8 September 13th. 9 Is there any other pretrial matter that we need to 10 address? 11 MS. MUSSER: Nothing from FTC. 12 MR. WOLF: Nothing from Kroger, Your Honor. 13 MS. MAINIGI: Nothing, Your Honor. 14 THE COURT: All right. Let's transition to 15 opening statements. 16 MS. MUSSER: Good morning, Your Honor. Before we 17 get started, may my colleague approach the bench with copies 18 of our opening demonstrative? 19 THE COURT: Absolutely. 20 MS. MUSSER: And I'm also going to ask my 21 colleague, Mr. Anderson, to flip over this whiteboard if 22 Your Honor is okay with it. 23 THE COURT: I am fine with it. Thank you. 24 MS. MUSSER: And, Your Honor, in the binder in 25 front of you is an unredacted copy of the slides that

plaintiffs will be showing today.

THE COURT: Wonderful.

MS. MUSSER: In order to facilitate protection of confidential information, per our discussions, we will be showing the redacted version on the slides for the public today.

THE COURT: We understand that now we have the public line open, and it will be open through the opening statements. So anyone who chose to call in on that number can hear.

OPENING STATEMENT ON BEHALF OF FTC

MS. MUSSER: Thank you, Your Honor. My name is Susan Musser, and I'll be presenting the opening statement on behalf of plaintiffs, along with my colleague Ms. Hall.

Your Honor, Americans across the country are united by the common experience of coming together over the dinner table to break bread with their friends and family. Whether they're paying by cash, putting groceries on credit, or paying with an EBT, Americans depend on supermarkets to provide affordable, quality groceries to feed their families.

But feeding your family has gotten more and more expensive over the last several years. Rising grocery prices has squeezed budgets, making it more difficult for

Americans to put food on the table. In thousands of communities across the country, Americans currently turn to supermarkets run by Kroger and Albertsons, such as Kroger's Fred Meyer or Albertsons Safeway stores here in Portland, to get groceries for the week.

Kroger and Albertsons, in turn, compete to increase foot traffic and the amount shoppers purchase at their stores. They do this by enticing shoppers through lower prices, promotion, increasing selection, and creating an overall more enticing shopping experience.

American families, in turn, benefit by reaping the fruits of this competition, by receiving better groceries for less.

To serve their shoppers, Kroger and Albertsons employ over 710,000 employees across the country. Many of these employees are union workers. Currently, workers across the country benefit from being able to leverage Kroger and Albertsons' competition against each other when coming to the bargaining table to get better benefits and wages for workers.

Kroger has now entered into a \$25 billion deal to purchase Albertsons. This is the largest American grocery acquisition in history. This multibillion-dollar deal would result in Kroger swallowing Albertsons and would eliminate the competition between these two companies that shoppers

and union workers depend on in one fell swoop.

The FTC is joined by its co-plaintiff states: Arizona, California, the District of Columbia, Illinois, Maryland, Nevada, New Mexico, Oregon, and Wyoming, in seeking to block this transaction.

Colorado and Washington have filed separate lawsuits in their own respective state courts, similarly seeking to block this deal.

This lawsuit is part of an effort aimed at helping
Americans feed their families. Stopping this
multibillion-dollar deal will keep in place the vigorous
competition that acts as a check on rising grocery prices
and spurs improvements in quality and innovation.

But plaintiffs are not asking this Court to stop the transaction. That is an issue that will be resolved in the related administrative proceeding, which is where the full merits adjudication is happening.

Rather, plaintiffs are here today, in this proceeding, to simply ask this Court to push pause on the transaction and to prevent the defendants from closing the deal during the time the FTC will meet -- will need to complete the merits proceeding that it has asked to begin on October 1st.

To meet our burden here in this proceeding, plaintiffs need only raise serious and substantial questions justifying a full inquiry in the merits.

To meet that burden, plaintiffs will raise serious and substantial questions in two ways: The first is by producing evidence showing harm in thousands of local supermarket product markets accounting for over \$70 billion in sales; second, by producing evidence of harm in dozens of markets for union grocery workers.

Defendants will not be able to meet their burden to rebut this prima facie showing, either by showing evidence of efficiencies or showing that their fixed -- and facts fixes the problems with this deal.

But taking a step back is helpful to put the scope of these companies' operations and competition in context. Ir preview, some of the evidence this Court will hear.

On the screen in front of you and on the left, demonstrative in front of the Court, shows the dozens of banners or brands of supermarkets that Kroger and Albertsons operate across the country.

Again, for example, here in Portland, Kroger operates

QFC and Fred Meyer's banners, and Alberts -- Albertsons

operates the Safeway and Albertsons stores. Kroger

acquired -- Kroger and Albertsons both acquired these

banners through a series of acquisitions following a general

trend of consolidation across the supermarket industry.

As a result of these acquisitions, these companies today are two of the largest supermarkets in the country.

Separately, Kroger owns over 2,700 stores; 2,257 pharmacies; employs over 414,000 workers; and operates in 35 states and the District of Columbia.

In turn, Albertsons employs over 2,200 stores -- or owns 2,200 stores; operates 1,725 pharmacies; and employs 285,000 workers. It also operates in 34 states and across District of Columbia.

Collectively, these two companies would operate over 5,000 stores; 4,000 fuel centers; 4,000 pharmacies; 66 distribution centers; 52 manufacturing plants.

Together, defendants would control \$220 billion of annual commerce and employ over 710,000 workers.

Today, Kroger and Albertsons compete in communities spanning 22 states, running from -- ranging from D.C. to southern states, like New Mexico, and all along the West Coast.

Now, defendants like to use this map to argue that these companies are complements, not competitors. And I'm sure if you zoom out far enough from a boardroom in Cincinnati or Boise, it may look like that. But antitrust laws tell you to look closer to see where the competition is occurring in order to understand the impact of an acquisition.

So let's zoom in just a little bit. Let's zoom in to here in Oregon. And when you zoom in, the picture becomes

just a little clearer, and you start to see the extent that Kroger and Albertsons overlap in local communities across the state.

After this merger, instead of having two options, these Oregon stores will be owned by one company.

Now, the FTC has an email where the public can write the FTC to express any antitrust concerns they may have. After this merger was announced, over 100,000 members of the public took time out of their day to email the FTC to say that they were worried. This is an unprecedented number.

In Oregon alone, 4,961 Oregonians wrote to express concern. But to understand where competition is flourishing, you can't just look at Oregon. You need to zoom in further, which makes sense, Your Honor, because, as evidence throughout the course of this proceeding will tell, grocery competition is local. And if a shopper in Portland is faced with higher prices, they can't practically go to somewhere in Eugene. So you need to focus on where the harm is felt which is to zoom in further to local communities.

So let's do that. Zooming in further to Corvallis, for example, here you see the Kroger and Albertson stores are represented by blue and red teardrops.

Currently, Albertsons owns 33 percent of the market share in this area and Kroger 27. If this acquisition is allowed to go through, they collectively will own four out

of six supermarkets in this area and control 60 percent of the market. That means less choices for the Corvallis community and more power for the collective Kroger and Albertsons entity.

Unsurprisingly, Corvallis shoppers are concerned about the acquisition in their community. 107 took the time to write to the FTC, and when you expand that to the surrounding communities, that number jumps to 669.

But, of course, this harm just isn't about Corvallis or even Oregon, but this dynamic and this story plays out in community after community across the country. So let's look at just one more example. Let's zoom into Santa Fe represented by my co-plaintiffs' state.

Here, Santa Fe shows that pre-merger Albertsons has a 37 percent market share and Kroger has a 22 percent market share.

Collectively, after this acquisition, that market share will jump to a combined 59 percent, and the combined entity will own five out of eight options in this local area.

Again, meaning less choices for customers and more power for the merging form.

And, again, Santa Fe shoppers are concerned. 278 took time out of their day to write to the FTC expressing that concern over this transaction. In the upcoming weeks, plaintiffs will show this Court evidence support its prima

facie case that validates these shoppers' concerns.

Let's start with the evidence plaintiffs will put forward to show harm in the supermarket line of commerce.

Now, the supermarket line of commerce includes traditional grocery stores, such as Kroger and Albertsons, as well as supercenters, such as Walmart and Target.

And plaintiffs' supermarket case rests on two pillars of evidence. First, plaintiffs will introduce documents and testimony showing current robust head-to-head competition between Kroger and Albertsons across multiple lines of commerce.

Second, plaintiffs will show that this merger increases market concentration in thousands of communities across the country. Both types of evidence, both pillars, point to the same conclusion, that this transaction will substantially lessen competition and shoppers will face the risk of increased prices, lower quality, and less innovation.

So let's start with some of the evidence that this Court will see about head-to-head competition.

Courts have recognized that a merger that eliminates head-to-head competition can result in a substantial lessening of competition. When assessing the extent of head-to-head competition, courts look at two buckets of evidence. They look at ordinary course documents and witness testimony.

Here, plaintiffs will present both types of evidence throughout this hearing.

First, evidence will show that Kroger and Albertsons compete both in non-price and price competition. Let's start with some non-price examples.

On the screen in front of you are statements taken from Kroger and Albertsons' 10-K. And what these statements show is that they both go to market trying to provide better products and better services for their shoppers across the country in a lot of the same ways.

For example, evidence will show and their 10-Ks explain that they can compete to provide fresh produce. They also can compete by providing private label products called Our Brands by Kroger and Own Brands by Albertsons. They compete by offering promotions and lower prices to drive loyalty. They also compete to provide convenient pickup and delivery options. And, finally, they can beat by providing back-end services to support their customer-facing efforts.

And shoppers benefit from that competition today. They benefit with better choices at both stores. At Albertsons stores and Kroger stores listed on these banners in front of the Court. Benefits that they will lose if this acquisition is allowed to go through.

Turning next to price competition, you will hear testimony from -- today and tomorrow from two pricing

executives at Kroger and Albertsons, Andy Groff and
Tony Silva. These two executives will explain that
Albertsons and Kroger execute what they call "high-low
pricing." And this high-low pricing has two components. It
has a base price, and it has a promotional price. And these
promotions are certain discounts, such as coupons, off that
base price.

And Kroger's and Albertsons' witnesses and documents will show that they both compete with each other on both types of pricing.

Turning first to Albertsons, to set their base pricing Albertsons uses two inputs: Walmart and what it identifies as a primary food competitor. A Kroger banner in most markets today.

Albertsons' goal with this primary food competitor is to have an imperceptible price gap. In other words, they try to match or reduce that gap as much as possible. They compete. For example, witnesses will explain that here, in Portland, Albertsons' primary food competitor or grocery competitor is Fred Meyer, and when pricing products across its stores, Albertsons tries to price as closely as possible to its Fred Meyer competitor.

Indeed, throughout this hearing, the Court will see evidence from data collected by the parties that show that Kroger's banners account for 79 percent of Albertsons'

primary grocery competitor in overlap areas. So where both -- where both companies have overlap, where they both have a presence, 79 percent of the time that price that they're trying to imperceptibly narrow that gap is a Kroger banner.

The Court will also hear evidence that over the last seven several years Albertsons has gotten increasingly aggressive to try and match Kroger prices. Albertsons has created a new program it calls the Price Advisor Program. This program mechanizes the process of searching and comparing Albertsons' prices to its primary grocery competitors' prices, and it makes alerts and recommendations based on that competitor's pricing. Again, Kroger banners in areas where they overlap.

But absent this acquisition, Albertsons won't stop there. Evidence will show that Albertsons will continue to develop this program to make pricing against its primary grocery competitor more and more automatic; in other words, institutionalizing this price competition between Kroger and Albertsons.

Now, Kroger's pricing is a little bit more complicated.

But, again, when you zoom in, you'll see that Kroger's

prices are also impacted by Albertsons'.

Now, Kroger uses two tools in order to set its pricing. It use a parity pricing, which is simple. It means matching

the lowest price. So pricing at parity. And it uses what's called the high-priced retail rule. Also called or referred to as HPR.

Plaintiffs will present evidence in either scenario.

Kroger is lowering prices in response to competition from Albertsons.

So turning to the slide in front of you, which has been redacted -- and, Your Honor, just one admin note on these slides: On the lower left of these slides you'll see a "PX" number. That's the document that these exhibits have been taken from. And on the lower right, you'll see which company they come in as identified by their logo.

So looking at this document, you can see both types of pricing in action. Under certain types of products, the parity pricing, those are products that they are trying to match the price of.

Frequently, Kroger tries to match Albertsons' pricing or Walmart's pricing but not always.

Here in this market, as you see in the star in the middle of the screen, QFC strategy is a Safeway match. So in some markets, that parity pricing is set against an Albertsons store.

You also see the floor-ceiling shown throughout this graphic. That floor-ceiling shows the high-price retail rule in action.

The next slide is an additional ordinary course document which explains this HPR rule in greater detail. As this slide explains, when using the HPR rule, Kroger uses Walmart as a floor and Target's -- a particular spread or range above Walmart.

That range, however, is capped by a ceiling. That ceiling is set from pricing against a traditional or supermarket competitor, called the HPR. This ceiling is designed -- and I quote -- "To ensure they are not priced significantly higher than a traditional retail competitor."

At bottom, what this sailing -- ceiling does is prevent Kroger's from losing sales to its traditional supermarket competitor.

And as this slide shows, to ensure that they are pricing under the ceiling, Kroger invested millions of dollars, which I'm not displaying because of the confidentiality issues; but, again, what this document shows is the millions of dollars that, in just this example, in just this quarter, and in just this region, Kroger is investing in order to reduce their price to match competition from their high-priced retailer rule; so, in other words, to not go above that ceiling.

On the right-hand side there's a couple of charts. And these charts show that often Albertsons is the HPR. For example, you can see throughout this -- these two charts

that Albertsons' banners, such as the Albertsons and Safeway banners, are listed as the HPR.

Now, the graphic in front of you can --

You can turn to the next slide, please. Go ahead and click on the animation.

The graphic in front of you shows the impact of this
HPR rule on prices. As I mentioned earlier, Albertsons is
trying to lower and lower that ceiling. Meaning, Albertsons
is putting downward pricing pressure by lowering that
ceiling and reducing the spread that our -- that Kroger can
price against Walmart. This is competition in action.

If this acquisition is allowed to go through, Albertsons will no longer have that same incentive to compete and to lower that ceiling. Kroger, in turn, will no longer have the same pressure from Albertsons to also compete to avoid losing shares by bumping up against that lowered ceiling, which means, absent this merger -- or if this merger is allowed to go through, there will be an increased ability and incentive, by Kroger, to raise prices post-merger, all competition that will be lost if this acquisition proceeds.

In addition to Tony Silva and Andy Groff, this Court will also hear evidence from division presidents from both Kroger and Albertsons in charge of Alaska, Washington, Oregon, Colorado, Idaho -- Idaho, Utah, southern California,

and Illinois. These division presidents will testify about boots-on-the-ground pricing and non-pricing competition between Kroger and Albertson banners.

For example, in this next slide, there is an email from John Beretta reporting out on competition in particular divisions around the Easter holiday. He is reporting to Susan Morris, the CE -- COO, and one of defendants' witnesses.

And in reporting on the progress of these different divisions, there's a common theme here. And the common theme is that when reading out on the status of competition and how they're doing, that they're reading out on the results of competition with a Kroger banner.

For example, you see Kings listed here, which is King Soopers; FM, which is Fred Meyer; Mariano's, another banner; and Ralphs and Fry's. In each case, they are discussing beating or winning -- in some cases, losing -- against Kroger.

These are all discussing the results of competition, and this competition is what's at stake with this merger.

In addition, this Court will also see and hear evidence about promotional pricing. And promotions can either be set through a weekly printed ad or through access through an app on a Kroger and Albertsons app on your phone.

Promos are often targeted at competition to try and

steal customers through lower prices, and here you can see a division President, Todd Broderick, from the Denver Division, comparing promo ads from Safeway's and Albertsons' banners on the left, to King Soopers, a Kroger banner, on the right.

These two ads show that they're offering promotions on similar products. Mr. Broderick reports out the results of this competition. He explains that the beating continues, and his colleague, Tina Lucero, who produced these text messages, responds, "Crush them."

He replies, "Their lower lips are quivering."

On the next slide is yet another example of the type of documents and testimony this Court will see. This is another business deck showing the plans to compete around the holiday time.

Here, Albertsons -- Albertsons is assessing what its competitor Fred Meyer's is trying to do around the holidays and trying to predict trends in history in order to beat that, in order to compete, to drive traffic to their stores.

And, finally, one additional example of non-price competition: Here's an email CCing Todd Broderick, and this email is planning for what to do in response to a King Soopers entry in this particular market. Here, an Albertsons employee is emailing Mr. Broderick a rough list of items that they could do to better compete with the

impending King Soopers store. How can they make their store better in order to respond to new competition from Kroger?

This brainstorming list includes everything from polishing the floor to putting in a new kiosk to updating various cases and delis.

Throughout this hearing, the FTC will show extensive evidence of competition between Kroger and Albertsons and markets across the country. But we are not relying on this evidence alone, which leads to the second way that plaintiffs will meet their prima facie burden in their supermarket case.

Plaintiffs will also show that this acquisition is presumptively anticompetitive due to changes in market structure and concentration in communities throughout the country.

As the Supreme Court explained in *Philadelphia National Bank*, when a merger results in a significant increase in competition, it is, and I quote, "inherently likely to lessen competition substantially, that it must be enjoined," which makes sense, Your Honor, because the fewer choices consumers have, the more likely consumers will suffer when there is consolidation in a particular industry.

To determine whether there's an increase in competition, plaintiffs must first define a product and a geographic market, and the purpose of defining a market is a

very pragmatic one. Namely, it asks the question, "If this merger is allowed to go through, are there sufficient alternative products or services that customers can turn to to avoid being harmed, but a small and a significant increase in price or a decrease in quality?"

Here, plaintiffs define two markets: They define the supermarket's product market on the left, which is composed of two big buckets. The first is traditional supermarkets, such as Stater Brothers, who you will hear from later today, as well as Kroger, Albertsons, and Raley's. It's also composed of supercenters, such as Walmart, Fred Meyer, and Target.

Plaintiffs also expand that market to see whether harm is occurring in a broader market. This market takes a supermarket product market and adds club stores, limited assortment stores, and natural and gourmet stores.

Starting first with plaintiffs' analysis and the supermarket product market. Courts have made clear that a market can be comprised of a set of stores that offer a unique experience.

Here, the supermarket stores offer a unique one-stop shop experience.

Now, defendants make two primary arguments against plaintiffs' market definition. First, that because people buy food at different places, plaintiffs have not properly

defined a market, but evidence -- as the evidence will show, customers shop at different stores in different situations.

For example, a shopper may buy a Gatorade on the way home from sports practice at a convenience store and also purchase a case of water at a supermarket.

As Dr. Hill will explain, plaintiffs' expert, this does not illustrate that these stores are in any way substitutes.

The second primary argument is that because you can buy a Gatorade both at a convenience store and a supermarket, those two formats must be in the same market. This is commonly called cross-shopping. But courts have already rejected this argument.

As the court explained in *Whole Foods* and the *Google* court recently validated, the fact that a customer might buy a stick of gum at a supermarket and a convenience store does not mean there is no definable groceries market.

In support of its market, plaintiffs will produce three buckets of evidence.

First, plaintiffs will introduce ordinary course documents and testimony establishing the *Brown Shoe* practical indicia, which assesses the characteristics of products in and out of the market to draw distinctions between the two.

Second, plaintiffs will present expert testimony regarding the hypothetical monopolist test. This is the

gold standard used by economists and supported by case law to define a market.

And, third, plaintiffs will present extensive evidence of the head-to-head competition, such as the evidence that I just walked through.

First, supermarkets are a one-stop shop. This Court will hear evidence and see ordinary course documents establishing what a one-stop shop is and that both Kroger and Albertsons are such shops.

First, Ms. Morris explains that winning means having the items our customer wants when they want them. And what they are telling Albertsons is that they want one-stop shopping.

Second, Kroger's own website says that early on people had to shop at a butcher, a baker, and a grocer, and that Kroger became the first grocer in the country to establish its own bakeries, followed by integration of the meat department.

Their innovation was one-stop shopping.

Now, to provide this one-stop shop experience, supermarkets offer a breadth and depth of products. Breadth refers to the range of products that a supermarket offers, and depth refers to the range of products within a particular type of category.

For example, you see on this screen an example of a

Kroger supermarket, and the breadth of products is shown by the row after row of glass cases in the back providing a myriad of options for shoppers to choose from.

The depth of product selection is shown by the three or four options of tomatoes shown on the front of the screen.

A few additional examples of the depth and breadth of product assortment include that supermarkets offer both what's called a national brand, such as Coke or Pepsi, as well as their private label brands.

These private label brands are specific to a certain store. For example, O Organics at Albertsons or Simple Truth at Kroger.

Second, supermarkets also provide a range of package sizes. For example, you can choose between getting a multipack bag of chips as well as just a single bag of Tostitos.

Third, supermarkets also offer a wide range of meat and seafood counters as well as grab-and-go snacks and other meals.

Throughout the course of this hearing, this Court will also hear from witnesses from a variety of store formats that explain these differences in more detail.

For example, this Court will hear from Raley's and Stater Brothers that explain how their supermarkets offer the same one-stop shopping experience as Kroger and

Albertsons.

In contrast, witnesses from Dollar Tree, Sprouts, and other store formats will explain how they provide a fundamentally different shopping experience.

And their testimony is supported by common sense and an observation of the different characteristics of these formats.

For example, the store format on the right, at

Dollar Tree, has a smaller footprint and a much smaller

selection, as you can see. So too with convenience stores,

such as CVS. This common sense will be supported by

testimony from witnesses and other ordinary course

documents.

So too with the next store format, which is Natural Grocers and Trader Joe's. Natural Grocers is an example of a premium organic market, and these premium and organic markets involve a different type of shopping experience.

Sprouts will explain that their stores offer what they call a treasure hunt experience, and Trader Joe's executive explained in deposition that they offer a much smaller selection than what you would see at a supermarket.

So, for example, you're not going to find a box of Lucky Charms at National Grocers or a Red Baron Pizza at Trader Joe's.

Similarly, stores such as Aldi's, commonly referred to

as "limited assortment stores," also offer a different range of options.

For example, as you can see here in the bakery, you don't have the option to get a personalized cake for your son's birthday, nor do you have the same selection of national brands that you're going to find in a supermarket.

And, finally, club stores, such as Sam's Club or Costco, also have a fundamentally different experience.

First, they require a membership, so you have to pay to go in the store.

Second, they often provide purchases in bulk, as you can see on the screen in front of you. As their witness explained, you can't just get a single avocado at a Costco.

Throughout the course of this hearing, plaintiffs will show that supermarkets differ from other store formats across key characteristics. An analysis of those features under the *Brown Shoe* practical indicia will show that shoppers view supermarkets differently, and having to replace their supermarket shopping with another store format will simply not offer that same experience.

Turning quickly from product market to geographic market, throughout the course of this hearing, plaintiffs will also present ordinary course evidence showing that competition is local.

For example, this Court will hear from both

Vivek Sankaran and Rodney McMullen who will explain that customers prefer to shop local and, as such, their competition is local, which, again, Your Honor, makes sense, as I started this presentation with whether or not a shopper has good grocery offers in Portland is irrelevant to a shopper in Corvallis.

Plaintiffs' market definition will also be supported by the testimony of Dr. Nicholas Hill. He will provide support in both -- in support of the proposed markets as well as the finding that this acquisition causes a reasonable probability of substantially lessen competition.

First, Dr. Hill will assess data produced in the ordinary course and maintained by defendants that shows how frequently they price check other supermarkets.

For example, as you can see on the left, Albertsons price checks other supermarkets 99 percent of the time. So too with Kroger. In this particular category of items, called EDE, they price check supermarkets 79 percent of the time.

Dr. Hill will also provide evidence in support of his application of the hypothetical monopolist test. This hypothetical monopolist test is the standard -- the gold standard that economists use to analyze a relevant product market.

Again, Dr. Hill uses real ordinary course data to show

what would happen if all supermarkets raised their price. And in applying the hypothetical monopolist test, Dr. Hill will explain both the precise methodology that he will use, which I won't get into here today, as well as his finding that over 2000 local supermarket markets passed that test, which means in those markets, supermarkets -- there's not reasonable choices outside of those markets to offset a potential small but significant increase in price.

Now, once the market has been defined, the next step of the analysis, as described by case law, is to assess the total market share and changes in concentration levels.

The FTC and DOJ merger guidelines provide certain thresholds supported by case law that provide a rubric of when the change in market structure, the change in shares and concentration, is presumptively anticompetitive.

Dr. Hill will explain that, after looking at concentration levels post-merger, 1,922 local supermarket markets meet that threshold. The total sales of those markets are \$73 billion, Your Honor.

Dr. Hill will not just offer the opinion regarding changes in concentration levels. He analyzed this harm in this case using an economic tool called CMCRs or compensating marginal cost reduction. CMCRs assess the incentive for the firm post-merger to increase price. Here, Dr. Hill will explain both the mechanics of that rule in his

application of it as well as his results, which is that he identified 1,472 supermarket local markets where the merger would need to generate efficiencies of more than five percent to offset the incentive to raise prices in those local markets.

Dr. Hill will also talk about a second market, the large-format market that I previously introduced. Here, Dr. Hill will expand his market to include both supermarkets, as well as club stores, limited assortment stores, and natural stores. His results don't change fundamentally.

He will show that even in the large format market, which includes Costco and Whole Foods --

If you could go to the next slide, please.

-- that there are still harm in thousands of stores affecting billions of dollars of sales.

Now, I expect that throughout the course of this hearing you will hear much ado about Walmart, Target,
Amazon, and Costco, but plaintiffs account for each of these competitors when defining markets and assessing harm.

So taking each of those in turn, Walmart and Target, those two companies are included in our supermarket product market. Amazon. Now, Amazon has two components of their brick-and-mortar grocery business. The first is Amazon Fresh. Evidence produced throughout the course of this

hearing will show that Amazon Fresh has quite a limited footprint and that defendants will not be able to meet their burden to show that Amazon Fresh is going to expand in a timely, sufficient, and likely way to offset any of Dr. Hill's conclusions.

And the second type of brick-and-mortar store that

Amazon owns is Whole Foods, and as I previously mentioned,

Dr. Hill accounts for that in his large format market.

And, finally, Costco. Similarly, Costco is accounted in the plaintiffs' analysis of their large format market.

Over the upcoming weeks, plaintiffs will present emails, text, and witnesses in support of his prima fascia supermarket case, but plaintiffs will also produce evidence in support of their labor case as well.

Today defendants are the two largest employers of union grocery workers in the country. Currently, when unions are negotiating with one company, let's say Albertsons, it can leverage Kroger to obtain better terms at the bargaining table. Plaintiffs will raise a serious and substantial question that this acquisition will lessen competition for union grocery workers by reducing that bargaining leverage.

Throughout the course of this hearing, plaintiffs will put on testimony of both union witnesses and defendants' own employees responsible for union bargaining. These witnesses and ordinary course documents will support that there's --

the credible threat of strikes matter, that the threat of being able to strike is an important tool for witnesses -- or for unions at the bargaining table.

Now, strikes can have an extraordinary impact on stores. The stores can lose sales and suffer lasting reputational harm. Unions, in particular, use what they call a whipsaw strike. In a whipsaw strike, workers start by targeting one employer, threatening that employer with a strike. Once an agreement is reached, workers then go to that employer's competitor to try and extract terms from that competitor, or they say they will strike there, and all of those shoppers will go to their competitor.

And because each company doesn't want to lose sales to their main competitor, they're more likely to give in to the union's request for better wages and working conditions.

Now, today Kroger and Albertsons negotiate separately.

Ordinary course documents will show that Kroger attempts to align with Albertsons on negotiation tactics but that Albertsons resists those efforts. Plaintiffs will present ordinary course documents, such as this text chain from Jon McPherson from Kroger, to say that Kroger's frustrated by this because they, quote, get stuck with their -- Albertsons' deal -- every time.

And I just want to take a pause here, and I want to be clear that that deal, while worse for Kroger, is better for

workers, meaning higher wages or better benefits.

And this deal will allow Kroger a way out of having to get stuck with Albertsons' terms.

Due to time constraints, plaintiffs are only presenting a limited snapshot of evidence throughout this hearing. Plaintiffs will be presenting the remaining witnesses at the administrative hearing. But throughout the upcoming weeks, plaintiffs will more than meet their burden to show a serious and substantial question that this transaction will have a reasonable probability of substantially lessening competition by reducing bargaining leverage in the market for union grocery worker -- workers in CBA areas throughout the country.

Now, once plaintiffs meet their prima facie burden, the burden then shifts to defendants to produce evidence in response. Defendants will be unable to meet their burden.

Now, defendants' attorneys in the past have admitted that defendants compete with each other and that this proposed merger would raise competitive concerns absent a divestiture. Defendants' lawyers' statements are supported by boots-on-the-ground evidence from their workers.

Defendants' employees expressed concern when this acquisition was announced. For example, Usman Humayun, the group VP of Enterprise Marketing, said, "Unless you try to arque that Walmart and Target would never let you have a

monopoly, you are basically creating a monopoly in grocery with the merger. So it makes no sense." He goes on to say, "It's like AT&T and Verizon wanting to merge."

Mike Brown, a senior category manager at Kroger, explained that the FTC would be all over this.

Now, it's no surprise that defendants are now walking away from their counsel's statements and their own employees' statements, but plaintiffs are confident that defendants will be unable to provide sufficient evidence here to rebut plaintiffs' prima facie case. As such, their case will hinge on their ability to meet their burden on their purported efficiencies and the fix.

I'd like to focus briefly on their arguments regarding efficiencies and the evidence you will see rebutting those, and then my colleague will discuss defendants' proposed divestitures.

First, defendants bear the burden to show cognizable efficiencies. To show these efficiencies, defendants must do four things: They must show they're verifiable, merger-specific, pass on to customers, and sufficient to offset the competitive harm. The reason that the law requires the defendants to bear this burden is twofold: First, under the burden-shifting framework, efficiencies are only assessed once plaintiff had met their burden, meaning they have raised a question of a likelihood of harm.

Because of that, the law requires evidence to provide evidence sufficient to allow plaintiffs in the court to recreate their efficiencies.

They also have to show that these efficiencies couldn't be achieved in a non-anticompetitive manner, meaning that they're merger-specific. The only way these efficiencies will result is risking harm to shoppers.

And, third, they must be of sufficient scope to offset the harm. Again, to ensure that the risk of an anticompetitive transaction does not go to American shoppers.

The second reason defendants bear the burden is because they have unique access to the evidence needed to support their claims. As such, the Supreme Court has counseled that defendants in these cases should bear the burden to provide facts in support of it.

Plaintiffs will present the evidence of Mr. Yeater to analyze these purported efficiencies. Mr. Yeater will explain that he will only -- was only able to validate or verify a small percentage of them. Specifically, he will explain that, at bottom, most of defendants' purported efficiencies suffer from the same fundamental flaw.

Meaning, they look at Scenario B under Kroger, Scenario A under Albertsons, and assume that the best case will happen; and there's no basis for that assumption, as Dr. --

Mr. Yeater will explain.

Now, I want to address one related point separately, and this is defendants' promise of a \$1 billion price investment.

First, it's helpful to put that promise in context.

While a billion is a lot of money to ordinary Americans, in the context of the state of this -- stakes of this acquisition, it's pennies on the dollar. For example, it's 1/75th the amount of sales at the stores impacted by this acquisition. It's less than .5 percent of Kroger and Albertsons' total revenues, and it's only slightly more than the amount of money that Kroger and Albertsons have spent to push this acquisition through.

Second, these investments are contingent on the realization of certain efficiencies; meaning, unless those efficiencies that Mr. Yeater can't verify go through, this billion-dollar promise won't happen.

And, third, these promises need to be weighed against the competition that is already happening between these two companies.

As I have previously explained and as the evidence will show, the company, Albertsons in particular, are currently investing in price investments to price max against competition; and, in response, Kroger is also investing in order to reduce prices and attract customers.

And as we walked through and as the evidence will show, head-to-head competition between these two companies is certain, and it's also certain that this acquisition will eliminate that head-to-head competition.

That certainty must be weighed against unenforceable promises by defendants based on assumptions and contingencies that are not tailored to the scope of this harm here on either a scale or where these promises allegedly will be effectuated.

As such, with logic, evidence, and the law, we'll explain where the scales should tip, which is towards pushing pause on this merger.

As you can see from this text message on the screen, this was a text sent from Matt Shores to Todd Broderick while watching Rodney McMullen testify in Congress.

Mr. Shores writes: It's all about pricing and competition, and we all know prices will not go down. A 500 million investment and pricing in our company won't get our prices down to Kroger's level, in my view. Therefore, the conclusion that's easily drawn is overall, prices will increase, as it's all about -- overall, prices will increase.

As Matt Shore wrote to Broderick, defendants will be unable to meet their burden to show cognizable efficiencies to balance the certain harm this acquisition will cause.

I'll now turn it over to my colleague Ms. Laura Hall to discuss divestiture.

MS. HALL: Your Honor, today I'd like to address a number of reasons why the proposed divestiture of 579 stores and other assets to C&S will not remedy the substantial lessening of competition likely to be caused by the acquisition.

Defendants say, "After the merger, prices will go down, no stores will close, and all store employees will remain employed." They claim that the proposed divestiture to C&S will sufficiently remedy any harm to competition. They also told the Part 3 administrative court that the prior divestiture of 413 stores, quote, included all the assets and personnel C&S will need to succeed.

Defendants say C&S will be able to improve poorly performing stores in the divestiture package, has experienced management to lead it through a transformative acquisition, and has made conservative assumptions about post-divestiture performance. We have heard these claims before about prior divestitures, and they did not bear out.

In connection with the Safeway acquisition, Albertsons represented to the FTC it would use efficiencies to cut prices, but its corporate representative could not specifically quote that that occurred.

About the divestiture of stores to Haggen, in

connection with the same merger, Albertsons told the FTC no stores would close, poor performance would be improved, all employees would keep their job, and Haggen had management to lead it through a transformative acquisition.

Haggen was in bankruptcy within months of the divestiture.

In seeking to acquire twelve stores divested from the Tops grocery chain, in connection with the Tops Price Chopper merger, C&S represented to the FTC that it had set up the retail organization to succeed and had a conservative deal model. The store's financial performance that divestiture and rebannering them to Grand Union has been challenged, to say the least. We will be calling Mark McGowan, the current head of C&S's retail business, to testify about this poor performance.

Defendants are primarily going to be relying on the testimony of hand-selected executives from their companies and C&S to testify to the divestiture's likelihood of success.

Essentially, defendants argue that C&S's business judgment should be trusted, but their proof stands in stark contrast to the ordinary course documents and assessment of past failures and an analysis of the deal package.

In ordinary course documents, C&S senior executives have expressed skepticism about the quality and long-term

viability of the stores they are acquiring. The stores from Kroger are their worst chains says Alona Florenz, whom we will be calling to testify about her projections for the divestiture.

Eric Kepner views the divestiture as a massive undertaking for a wholesaler with limited retail capability that poses more downside for C&S than for Kroger because C&S will have to establish new brands in many markets while trying to stand up a retail organization.

In response to a suggestion about reselling the divestiture stores, Ms. Florenz says, "Just be careful with FTC. We want to say we can run them."

Eric Winn, in talking points for notifying wholesale customers of the divestiture, likewise, suggests the stores may be for sale. Mr. Winn will also testify about C&S's plans in our case-in-chief.

Current C&S's board member and Mr. Winn's predecessor,
Bob Palmer, commented on draft press release about the
divestiture. "Do we have to say that we won't close doors?
The 'all' is a problem. The trick is that they stay open as
they transition, but then what? Are we committed to this?"

Let's turn to the legal framework under which the court evaluates the proposed divestiture.

Courts consider a structural remedy, like a divestiture, under the Sysco test, requiring that the

defendants produce evidence showing that the divestiture will restore all the competitive intensity lost as a result of the merger.

In *Illumina*, considering a conduct-based remedy, the Fifth Circuit held that it was sufficient for defendants to show that the proposed remedy sufficiently mitigates the merger's effect, such that it was no longer likely to substantially lessen competition.

Defendants cannot meet either standard.

At this stage the Court is presented with a binary choice: To pause the transaction pending the merits proceeding or not.

When applying the *Illumina* and *Sysco* standards in cases involving allegations of harm across multiple markets, a likelihood of harm in any market warrants enjoining the transaction, which makes sense. Whether or not the divestiture is sufficient in Denver will not help Portland shoppers if the divestiture is inadequate.

Antitrust law does not allow defendants to offset harms to some communities with benefits to others. The Court should enter a preliminary injunction if we show a serious issue with respect to post-transaction harm in a single geographic market and a single product market, whether supermarket or labor.

To be clear, plaintiffs will show a serious issue with

many more markets.

The economic evidence in this case will show that hundreds of markets are unremedied by the divestiture.

Dr. Hill's baseline calculation of the effect of the divestiture uses defendants' assumption of a perfect divestiture. That is, all of the stores continue their current level of competitive operation, which is not what C&S itself projects.

Dr. Hill calculated 1,002 supermarket product markets and 551 large format store markets in which the acquisition is presumptively unlawful, accounting for a perfect divestiture.

Let's look at how the divestiture affects the markets Ms. Musser discussed earlier.

Santa Fe is an example where the market around the Market Street at the top center of the map is presumptively unlawful, but there is no divestiture in this market. In fact, three other stores on this Santa Fe map are focal stores of markets that defendants' economist, Dr. Israel, concedes are presumptively illegal.

Corvallis, Oregon, is an example of a market where one store is divested, but the market around this Fred Meyer store, in the center, remains presumptively illegal.

Post-divestiture -- post-merger, the combined market share is 60 percent, post-divestiture the combined market share is

51 percent. The C&S store is predicted to have 9 percent of the market share.

In addition to the hundreds of markets that a perfect divestiture would not remedy, the evidence will show that competition is likely to be harmed in many additional markets.

Returning to the legal framework, because plaintiffs will be addressing the proposed divestiture remedy in our case-in-chief, defendants' burden of production in rebuttal is heightened.

In the face of the substantial evidence plaintiffs will present on the infirmities of the divestiture package and C&S as buyer, defendants have the burden of coming forward with evidence from which the Court could conclude that the divestiture will be successful.

Defendants' claims about the divestiture contradict their claims about the merger. Defendants simultaneously claim that the merger is necessary to improve Kroger's ability to compete against Walmart and Amazon and that C&S will be an effective competitor with a fraction of the stores. Dependency on Kroger for transition services, billions in extra cost, and an abysmal track record. Both of those claims can't be true.

As we will show, C&S is unlikely to be an effective competitor for a litany of reasons, including the failure to

even attempt to remedy hundreds of affected markets, as discussed earlier.

I will touch on each of these items briefly in connection with the product -- supermarket product market before discussing the union labor market.

Historically, C&S has closed underperforming retail stores and sold others to independent operators in connection with wholesale supply contracts.

Post-divestiture, it has ample incentive to do the same.

C&S has never even operated 110 retail stores at any one time. C&S's prior failures to operate in the same market are probative of the likely outcome of the divestiture; particularly, as it had then many of the same advantages defendants tout now, such as being an experienced wholesaler, having low debt, and hiring experienced retail executives.

As recently as last year, C&S stated that it acquires retail store locations in connection with strategic transactions to maintain or expand our grocery wholesaling and distribution business.

One glaring example of C&S's inexperience in retail operations, its diligence request to Kroger for a call, quote, "to discuss what it takes to operate a grocery store."

C&S executives have acknowledged the divestiture is not

a standalone business and lacks many assets necessary to run a successful retail grocery business.

As Mr. Winn testified, "The alternative is you buy a company, a fully functioning company, and that's not what we are buying here."

Turning to plaintiffs' expert evidence on the divestiture, Dr. Edward Fox, an expert on retail operations and customer behavior, has identified and assessed the challenges that C&S must overcome to turn the hodgepodge of stores, distribution centers, and various intellectual property licenses into a competitive retail grocery business.

Based on his expertise, Dr. Fox concludes that C&S will struggle across a number of areas that are important to attracting, retaining, and serving supermarket customers.

One of those areas is rebannering the acquired stores where C&S does not have ownership of or a license to the banner currently on the store. C&S will need to rebanner hundreds of stores. Rebannering a supermarket can mean not only changing the brand name on the storefront, but also the layout and the product assortment, to correspond with the brand identity. Rebannering on the scale required by the divestiture agreement, 286 stores in three years is unprecedented.

Moreover, C&S's currently plans to use banners

including QFC, Mariano's, and Carrs. Those are currently present only in the markets of Oregon and Washington, Illinois, and Alaska, respectively; but they plan to use them in numerous states in which they are unknown.

As Dr. Fox will explain and C&S acknowledges, introducing an unknown banner magnifies the risk of a substantial sales decline in each market.

This next slide, for confidentiality reasons, is only being shown to the Court and describes a transition services agreement under which C&S will be dependent on Kroger for a variety of services, including store operations, pricing, distribution, and supply of private label products for up to four years; and a license to the software backbone, known as the tech stack, for five.

C&S is also dependent on Kroger to provide hundreds of subject matter experts across a whole range of corporate operations, including experts in Kroger and Albertsons legacy systems it will need to operate.

These notes on C&S lists of requested IT employees make clear that C&S cannot simply hire in the general market to fulfill these needs.

This is a slide from a business plan that C&S produced in late June, after the close of fact discovery. So we have not had the opportunity to question any C&S witness about it. Particularly, this last bullet. "We will run the same

program between where we share markets until banner brands are separated. Pricing, promotion, loyalty, and other customer-basing programs." What it means is pretty clear, C&S does not intend to compete with Kroger on price for either base or promotional for up to three years. The deadline for C&S to complete rebannering. And under the transition services agreement, Kroger has to supply those base and promotional plans for at least a year.

C&S also has less incentive to compete aggressively than Albertsons currently does, because the divestiture purchase price is low compared to the value of the assets. That means C&S can recover on its investment without turning a profit in its retail operations. The store real estate alone is valued at more than two-thirds of the purchase price.

Together, with the benefit to C&S and its wholesale business of gaining new distribution centers and the retail stores as their captive customers, C&S can recoup its investment without the retail stores having to perform anywhere near as well as they currently do in defendants' hands.

C&S will thus have less incentive to incur the substantial costs to build out the infrastructure needed to operate the divestiture assets effectively.

Even with making those investments, C&S predicts the

divested stores will be less competitive in the future than they are now.

They predict that the -- that they will lose revenue following the divestiture and grow slower than the retail grocery market as a whole for the first three years.

C&S projects sales loss due to rebannering and over a billion dollars in expense rebannering, building new distribution centers, and creating a private label line of products. None of which are risks or costs the stores face today.

Not until eleven years after the divestiture, does C&S's own deal model predict returning to the stores' current level of profitability.

Turning to C&S's prior experience as a divestiture buyer -- this slide is also only for the Court -- defendants tout the FTC's approval of C&S as a divestiture buyer in connection with twelve stores divested from the Tops Price Chopper merger, but the post-divestiture performance of those stores, shown on this slide, has been a failure.

As of the end of 2023, the stores had experienced a 30 percent loss of sales with little prospect for improvement. C&S's sales volumes at these stores fell another 13 percent as of March 2020. These are rural stores, close to C&S's home base, all from one company. All of which C&S already supplied. Some of which C&S had

previously owned and operated. Those should be easier to run than the geographically dispersed package of stores that C&S now seeks to acquire. Yet, C&S is struggling with those stores.

If C&S struggles with operating the divestiture stores,

Dr. Hill shows that as the divested stores lose sales -
This can be for the whole courtroom.

-- the number of presumptive illegal markets rises.

Here, showing you the effect in the more conservative large format market.

As the stores lose sales, lose market share to other nearby supermarkets, many of which will be owned by Kroger, and the resulting increase in share by the Kroger, combined Kroger-Albertsons, increases the number of affected markets and the value of affected commerce. A 30 percent reduction in revenues at the divested stores, less than C&S has experienced to date with the Grand Union stores, causes nearly a 30 percent increase in presumptive illegal markets, and nearly a 40 percent increase in the value of affected commerce.

Turning to the labor product market, defendants do not even attempt to contend that the proposed divestiture to C&S will remedy the harms to labor markets caused by the acquisition.

First, in many markets, Kroger will become the only

union grocery employer, rendering the whipsaw strike tactic useless.

Second, Albertsons currently makes labor decisions, including whether and how to cooperate with Kroger, independently, and as Ms. Musser discussed, defendants struggle to coordinate effectively, such as by entering into mutual strike assistance agreements. Mr. McPherson says he's never actually signed one. C&S's dependence on Kroger for transition services is going to tilt the scales in favor of letting Kroger take the lead.

C&S doesn't have the experience to do otherwise. It has requested Kroger to provide it with labor relations employees. Kroger has only filled half of C&S's requests.

Even if C&S wanted to take an independent approach to labor -- to union negotiations, it will be too small in most markets. It will be a minor, not a major, like Kroger and Albertsons are today. The Court will hear from union representatives, third parties, and the parties themselves, that minors have little effect on the deals struck by the majors.

Thus, the divestiture is not going to eliminate the harm to competition in the supermarket product market or the labor market product market and -- or render it insubstantial.

Plaintiffs' proof will demonstrate the existence of a

substantial question worthy of further study in the merits proceeding, warranting an injunction pending resolution of the administrative proceeding.

The equities also favor an injunction. Defendants do not face the loss of a unique time-sensitive opportunity. If time were of the essence, defendants could have had resolution on the merits sooner if they had not sought to suspend the administrative merits proceeding.

They have already taken nearly two years from signing the merger agreement to get to this day. They are already enjoined from closing the transaction until a ruling by the Colorado state court after a trial that commences over a month from now.

The efficiencies that they claim are generic costs of doing business and will be there in three months or next year.

In any event, private equities have little weight in the Section 13(b) analysis. The purpose of 13(b) and the FTC Act is to serve the public interest in effective enforcement of the antitrust laws by the antitrust agencies.

Allowing an acquisition to close where the parties are direct competitors would be difficult to unwind and cause immediate harm to competition.

In a competitive market, companies act zealously to protect the confidential information. Their prices, their

discounts, their products and development.

We've seen that in this case, Your Honor, expressed through the confidentiality claims of the parties and the third parties. Irreversibly sharing that competitively sensitive information may frustrate any remedy ordered at the conclusion of the administrative proceedings.

Moreover, where the parties employ hundreds of thousands of people and feed millions, extra care is warranted. Consideration of the public equities means considering the risk that divestiture stores close and limit communities' access to fresh, healthy food.

Defendants claim an injunction would delay price cuts that they plan to make, but the Court will hear that their price investment plan starts with just a handful of products in Albertsons stores. Four state Attorneys General have submitted an amicus brief in support of the merger, but their states' residents will see price investment, at most, in one Jewel-Osco in Iowa. There are no Albertsons stores in the other three states.

The total price investment will also be staged over time, and Kroger has jettisoned to pass price investment plans to make earnings per share targets.

Consideration of the public equities also means considering employees, like Naomi Oligario, who wrote to the FTC about losing her job when Haggen's bankruptcy closed the

supermarket she had worked at for decades. Your Honor will hear directly from Ms. Oligario in these proceedings.

We respectfully submit, Your Honor, that the risk to employees and communities across the country, as well as the public interest in effective antitrust enforcement, weigh heavily against the parties' claimed equities.

Defendants are trying to make the standard one of absolute certainty that the merger will harm customers and that the divestiture will fail, but that turns the probabilistic standard of Section 7 of the Clayton Act on its head. The purpose of the Clayton Act is to arrest monopolies in their incipiency, and that requires considering whether a substantial lessening of competition may occur if the transaction proceeds.

The risks of harm to the parties from not getting a business deal through as quickly as they would like are vastly outweighed by the risk of being unable to effectuate a complete remedy if the merger is found to be unlawful and the risk to communities of losing well-paying union jobs and access to food to feed their families.

Because the divestiture is proposed to remedy the substantial loss to competition that may occur due to the acquisition, defendants bear the burden to establish it is likely to be effective in every single market in which the parties overlap.

In asking the Part 3 administrative court to let them 1 again amend their divestiture package, defendants all but 2 3 concede they cannot carry their burden to meet that standard. 4 5 This is a preliminary injunction hearing, not trial on 6 the merits, and time permits us to present only a sliver of the voluminous record that will be before the administrative 7 8 law judge. Therefore, any doubt should be resolved in favor of enjoining the transaction, pending adjudication on a full 9 record, with the ability to order an effective remedy. 10 Thank you, Your Honor. 11 12 THE COURT: Thank you. How are we doing on time? 13 14 Your Honor, might I suggest for the MR. WOLF: court reporter's benefit and perhaps for my own that --15 16 THE COURT: I was going to suggest a break. 17 That's why I was saying, "How are we doing on time?" Let's take a 15-minute break. 18 19 Thank you, Your Honor. MR. WOLF: 20 (Recess taken.) 21 DEPUTY COURTROOM CLERK: All rise. THE COURT: Pleat be seated. We'll continue with 22 opening statements. 23 24 MR. WOLF: Your Honor, may I approach with the copies? 25

THE COURT: Please, yes.

MR. WOLF: Thank you, Your Honor.

OPENING STATEMENT FOR KROGER

MR. WOLF: Matthew Wolf for Kroger.

The day after this merger closes, a shopper walking into the Safeway on Southwest Jefferson Street, just a few blocks away, will be in for a pleasant surprise. They will find that prices have come down on dozens of their most important purchases.

Those same reductions will be seen by folks around the country when they shop at the more than 1,700 Albertsons stores now owned by Kroger, and within 90 days, all of those shoppers will see further price reductions on more than 600 items that matter to them.

Beyond that, Kroger will be ramping up to investing a billion dollars every year specifically to bring down prices for the former Albertsons customers who are now part of the Kroger family.

Counsel minimized, attempted to diminish, the value of \$1 billion annual incremental price investment in her opening.

I suggest this betrays a fundamental misapprehension and misunderstanding of how such an investment works and the profound effect that investment will have on former

Albertsons customers throughout the country.

But Kroger is not just committed to bringing former Albertsons customers lower prices. It will invest \$1.3 billion dedicated to Albertsons stores to enhance the customer experience, and just as importantly, Kroger will spend an additional billion dollars a year, every year, on wages benefits for its associates.

All of this will only be possible if the merger goes through. And all of this comes with additional commitments, that there will be no store closures, no frontline job losses, enhance local food sourcing. It benefits both the farmer and the shopper. There will be 10 billion meals distributed to combat food insecurity in our neediest regions, and every single collective bargaining agreement will be transferred and maintained when the merger goes through.

Inexplicably, the plaintiffs in this case insist that this must not be allowed. Plaintiffs have, outside of this courtroom, and in, repeatedly and very publicly stated they are working to bring prices down, but their decision to bring this suit and the arguments they have made since filing suggest that they neither understand the industry nor the parties within it.

Now, I assume counsel misspoke earlier when she said the difference between Albertsons' pricing and Kroger's

pricing is -- the word was used -- "imperceptible." That is not reality. Kroger's prices are 10 to 12 percent lower than Albertsons'. 10 to 20 -- 12 percent lower.

One would think the plaintiffs would be pleased that a higher cost grocery store was going to be run by a lower cost competitor, but plaintiffs insist, by bringing this suit, by making the arguments they made this morning, that current Albertsons customers should continue to be forced to shop at stores with margins nearly a dozen percentage points higher than Kroger.

And in so doing, inexplicably, plaintiffs refuse to recognize the tectonic shift that has occurred in the grocery industry over the last 20 years. Refusing to acknowledge that, unless traditional grocers act, the dominance of Walmart and Costco and Amazon, and their ilk, will only grow with the inevitable and regrettable impact on shoppers' choices, downtown communities, local farmers, and union jobs.

And, inexplicably, we've heard just this morning plaintiffs denigrate and claim to know more about groceries than C&S, Kroger's divestiture partner. A 107-year-old family grocer company servicing more than 7,500 stores.

Your Honor, I submit that C&S has more institutional knowledge of the grocery industry in just one of its senior executives than all of the experts that the plaintiffs have

chosen to present to Your Honor combined.

So let's dig a little deeper to understand the players, the industry, and the deal.

First, Kroger.

Kroger was founded in 1883 in Cincinnati. And if you walk the streets of Cincinnati, you will still see corporate headquarters to this day. It has remained true to its roots. It has remained true to its community.

It is now composed of 2,700 stores in 35 states under 28 different banners, as plaintiffs helpfully put up on the board.

These are the folks you know. Fred Meyer, locally. Around the country, some of the most trusted brands in grocery.

And what is the guiding principle of Kroger? What is its DNA when it comes to groceries?

Well, Rodney McMullen, the CEO and chair of Kroger, who you'll hear from next week -- he'll be in this courtroom to answer any of Your Honor's or any of the plaintiffs' questions -- he said to the Senate last year, "Together, with Albertsons, our principal, Kroger's current principal, is allowing customers to stretch their grocery -- grocery budget without compromise."

Well, what does "without compromise" mean? It means, and this is a piece of a dec you'll hear from with

Mr. McMullen and Mr. Aitken as well, that, when it comes to fresh foods, we want to be as good as Whole Foods. When it comes to personalization, when it comes to knowing our customers, to giving them what they want, what they need, what matters to them the most, we want to be as good as Amazon, and we are. When it comes to our brands, what we call "private label," we want to be as good, we strive to be as good, we are as good as Costco. And when it comes to seamless. That means you can order in stores. You can get your curbside delivery. You can get delivered to your home. We want to be as good as Target, and we want to do all of this and we do do all of this at prices competitive to Walmart.

"Prices competitive to Walmart." What does that mean?
Well, you're going to hear also next week from
Stuart Aitken, the chief merchandising and marketing
officer. He's going to tell you, among other things, that
notwithstanding the extraordinary inflation and cost of
goods sold and fuel and everything else over the last three,
four, five years, that during that very window, when
inflation was pushing everyone to their limits, Kroger was
year after year after year bringing their prices more in
line with Walmart, bringing their margins down every year.

And they've done this, unlike many of our competitors, with the help of our union associates. 83 percent of

in-store Kroger associates work in a unionized store. We are a proud union shop, just as our merger partners, Albertsons.

We are also proud of the communities we live in, work in, and sell in.

Local food sourcing. We've talked about how critical that is. Service member support. Top scorers in equity indexes and otherwise. And the capstone of our community involvement, the Zero Hunger, Zero Waste Project, that to date has provided 3.5 billion meals to those in need, and with this merger, we'll be able to provide another 6.5 billion, all while reducing our carbon footprint, reducing waste. And all of this in what has been a tectonic shift in the grocery market over the last 10 years.

Your Honor has seen these headlines, but I think *The Wall Street Journal* summed it up best just last year:
Supermarkets are losing this food fight. And who are they losing it to? Walmart, Costco, Amazon, among others.

You're going to hear a lot in the next three weeks about what these companies have done to the market; what they have brought to the market, in terms of competitiveness; and what pressure they've put on Kroger and Albertsons and others to remain competitive and to get ever more competitive with pricing, quality, freshness, community, labor, et cetera.

So Walmart, a brief snapshot: In 2003 there were 40 --3,400 Walmart stores. By 2023 there were 5,300. Maybe 60 percent more. But their grocery sales have increased at a much more rapid pace. 2003, 63 billion in sales; last year, \$247 billion in sales. That's the focus -- the people we should be worrying about. That's the competitor you're going to be hearing about for the next three weeks. That's the company that we all are trying to reach, in terms of price, while at the same time maintaining commitments to our associates, to our customers, and to our union employees, which we have, unlike Walmart.

How about Costco?

2003: 318 stores. Roughly doubled by 2023. But their grocery sales far more than outstripped that doubling. In 2003 \$25 billion in sales, by 2023, 128 billion in sales; and, again, with trivial union involvement.

Amazon, similar.

2003, no brick-and-mortar grocery presence. Through the acquisition of Whole Foods and the creation of Amazon Fresh, they now have 600 stores. And what does that mean in terms of grocery sales? They've gone from 3 billion in 2003 to 36 billion in 2023. Remarkable growth. But, again, with almost no union involvement. Unlike Kroger. Unlike Albertsons.

And their competitive footprint is truly nationwide.

Walmart from coast to coast, Costco from coast to coast,

Amazon from coast to coast. Every address, every community,

every market.

And they're not alone. You're going to hear in this case from -- about Aldi, and Dollar General, and Lidl.

Folks that hope that in the next five, ten years they're going to have charts that look an awful lot like what I just showed you for Walmart and Costco and Amazon. These folks are taking enormous shares of the grocery market already and are poised to do much more, all at prices much lower than the incumbents'.

Now I'm going to talk very briefly about Albertsons because in a few minutes, my colleague, Ms. Mainigi, is going to talk about Albertsons' perspective. What brings them to the courthouse today, what brought them to the merger table last year.

But, briefly, Albertsons has 2,200 stores in 35 states. In 2022, it became known to Kroger that Albertsons was on the market, that Albertsons was potentially for sale, and we reached out and said, "Hey, this looks like a match that would make sense for us and, more importantly, would make sense for consumers and our associates."

Why?

Well, part of it is simple geography. I showed you that Walmart and Costco and Amazon are nationwide. The same

can't be said of either Albertsons or Kroger today.

Albertsons has a significant presence in the Northeast and West Texas and Northern California but next to nothing in the Midwest or the Southeast.

Kroger, on the other hand, almost the mirror image. Significant presence in the Midwest, the Southeast; significant presence in East Texas and the Plains states. You put them together, we now have a footprint that can compete against Walmart and Amazon and Costco. It is clearly complementary. It gives us the opportunity to benefit from scale, to benefit from savings, to pass that along to customers, to compete more effectively against the folks that have been dominating the market for the last 10 years.

But it's not just about scale. The savings that come from the merger are obvious and intuitive. Kroger might have the best price on Pepsi. Albertsons might have the best price on Coke. Put them together, and we get the best price on both, and then can pass that savings along to our customers.

With supply chain, we avoid redundancies, expand it.

Not only are we cheaper and, therefore, less expensive for our customers, but also faster, which means fresher for our customers.

Technology. Rather than running these

extraordinarily -- extraordinarily expensive tech stacks one to one, we combine them, save money, pass it along to customers.

You're going to hear in this case from Mafaz Maharoof, who's going to talk about the billions of dollars of savings and efficiencies that this merger will bring. Billions of dollars that will allow us to lower prices for our customers, to bring them fresher food, to bring them more local produce, to bring them competitive products.

Competitive not just on pricing to Walmart and Costco and Amazon, but better, fresher, faster, broader.

Now, we recognize and we recognized then, at the time we signed the merger agreement, that the map was not entirely complementary, that there were some overlaps; that we would need to divest some stores. And this trial, this preliminary injunction proceeding, will, in part, be about whether that divestiture will work.

You're going to hear from C&S Wholesale Grocers about their extraordinary story. They started in 1918 as a supplier of independent grocery stores. Now they have a nationwide network. Notice that word "nationwide" again, Your Honor. That's really important. That scale benefits us in the merger. It benefits C&S now.

Scale of 7,500 independent stores, all the way up to large chains. From the mom-and-pop and the bodega on the

corner, all the way up to nationally known brands they service today. They are, in fact, the eighth largest private company in the United States. They have more than 3,000 private label brands of their own today, and they support roughly 200 stores as -- as -- runs -- excuse me -- not support, but run 200 stores. 20 or so as owners, about 180 as franchisees. They have the experience. They have the infrastructure. They have the motivation. They have the commitment. They have the customers already raised up here in the Pacific Northwest they support. Holiday Market as well, in addition to national stores like Winn-Dixie, Target, and Giant.

And you're going to hear more later this week from Eric Winn, the CEO of C&S, who's going to be able to respond to counsel's suggestions at the end of her opening statement about all the purported inadequacies of C&S, about their lack of commitment, about their somewhat nefarious motivations implied, and you're going to hear from Mr. Winn directly about their excitement, their enthusiasm, their commitment, and their competence in performing their duties under this divestiture.

And you're going to hear about what C&S does today, from providing fresh produce to store design, from retail technology to digital marketing, from food shows and buying programs to private label products. Everything that a

supermarket does, they do today. They have the skills today.

But let's talk about what else the deal is going to bring them tomorrow. With the deal, Kroger will run about 4,500 stores. C&S about 600 stores, complementing the 7,500 they already run. Mr. Cosset, who's in the courtroom now, will explain the structure of the deal, explain what C&S is getting, both from Kroger and from Albertsons, and what it will allow them to do to compete successfully in those markets where there is overlap, where the parties acknowledge that there needs to be something done and there is being something done creating a vital new competitor.

After the merger, C&S is not just getting stores, they're getting people. You're going to hear from Susan Morris -- Ms. Mainigi is going to tell her more -- tell us more about her in a few minutes -- who's the current Chief Operating Officer of Albertsons. She is going to go over and run the grocery facility. She's got four decades of experience. Four decades of experience in the industry, and she's enthused and excited about this opportunity.

But it's not just Ms. Morris. You're going to hear about dozens of other senior executives, thousands of specialists, and 60,000 frontline associates, all of whom are working in stores today and will work in those same stores the day after the merger.

You're going to hear that C&S is going to get more than a half dozen private labels to expand their base, that they're getting a dairy, they're getting a transition services agreement to make sure that the handoff is seamless, increased distribution centers; and, again, of critical import, C&S is committed to a transfer of all collective bargaining agreements. Union jobs will be protected.

After the merger -- after the merger, you heard counsel refer in her opening statement to majors and minors, and she referred to C&S as a minor. And, respectfully, that's just plain wrong. After the merger, C&S will be the eighth largest grocery store in America. That's not minor.

They'll be bigger than H-E-B, Dollar General, Aldi, Walgreens, Trader Joe's, BJ's, I could go on. A vital new competitor both to Kroger and, just as importantly, Walmart, Costco, and Amazon.

Now let's move on to what brings us here today: The preliminary injunction standard.

And, Your Honor, you've read some of this in the pretrial briefing. You'll read more of it after. But there is a fundamental disagreement about what you're going to be deciding. Because, respectfully, we believe that the standard four-factor preliminary injunction test that Your Honor has applied time after time, that applies here.

The Supreme Court told us that just a few months ago in Starbucks. And so we're going to be talking about the test, the preliminary injunction standard, the four factors Your Honor is familiar with, and we're going to start with public interest, the extraordinary public interest in making sure that this merger happens for the benefit of consumers, for the benefit of associates, for the benefit of communities, for the benefit of unions.

First of all, the benefits to new Kroger customers and communities: Lower prices from day one, ramping up to a billion-dollar annual price investment. Revitalize Albertsons stores. Remember that \$1.35 billion in revitalized Albertsons stores and infrastructure? Fresher foods. Excuse me while I take a sip, Your Honor. I'm speaking too fast.

Enhanced stores and fulfillment networks. Improved data so that customers are told when a sale occurs or asked what they want to see prices lowered, that it's -- we're more reactive, more responsive, that our customers have a greater stake in how we price, how we ship, how we stock.

And a broader supplier base. More choices, more opportunities -- both national brands and private label -- all of this as a result of the merger.

And, Your Honor, there was a little sleight of hand that happened in plaintiffs' case. They talked about states

where there are overlapping stores, but their own expert, Dr. Hill, acknowledges that throughout 34 states there's no competitive risk, no competitive threat whatsoever. Two-thirds of this country will experience all of the benefits of the merger with none of the alleged risk that counsel has been talking about.

Now, we're going to suggest to you in just a few moments that risk is nonexistent. Certainly not sufficient to justify a preliminary injunction. But, in any event, when you're talking about the public interest, two-thirds of this country has nothing but benefit with none of the ascribed risk.

All right. Let's move on to the benefit to the new Kroger associates. The folks that were at Albertsons.

They're going to see higher wages, greater benefits, greater flexibility to transfer locations, a new tuition reimbursement program and financial coaching for all the associates. Up to \$21,000 an associate. And, again, a transfer of all CBAs. All of these opportunities will be presented to Albertsons' associates as a result of the merger.

How about C&S's customers? They're going to see 1.2 billion in C&S's own commitment to improving the Albertsons stores they're going to be acquiring. They're going to have private label expansion. I mentioned that C&S has 3,000 of

their own label brands already, but they're taking over seven -- some by license, some outright -- existing Albertsons private label brands. All of those will be accessible to their customers and extraordinary enhancements to distribution supply chain, which not only lowers prices, but it makes food fresher on the shelf.

Even current C&S customers -- remember you're on to those 7,500 folks that -- and "folks," that's a strange way to describe Winn-Dixie or Harris Teeter, but even the current folks will experience benefits. Let's focus on Ray's, for example. A small local Pacific Northwest grocery chain. They currently use C&S. They rely on C&S. C&S is their lifeblood, keeps them in business, keeps their prices low, keeps their shelves stocked.

They're going to benefit too from this merger, even though no one -- they're not changing hands. They're staying with Ray's.

Why?

They're going to have access to those same private label products that C&S is getting that they can put into the old Albertsons stores. They can put into the -- C&S can put into the 7,500 stores they currently service. That enhanced distribution and supply chain, that lowers prices and increases product availability. That becomes available to the existing C&S customers, not just the new C&S stores.

All of the services they provide will be enhanced, and so it will benefit not just Kroger stores and former Albertsons stores, but 7,500 other grocery stores that are striving to compete against the global behemoths: Walmart, Amazon, Costco, et cetera.

Public interest, Your Honor, we will show you over the next three weeks it unambiguously favors this merger. It unambiguously suggests to Your Honor that a preliminary injunction should not enter.

Now I want to talk about the middle two factors: The likelihood of irreparable harm and the balance of harms. Here's where we have a fundamental disconnect with the Government -- well, maybe one of many places we have a fundamental disconnect with the Government. This proceeding will decide the fate of the merger. Let there be no mistake. The suggestion that all you're being asked to do, Your Honor, is tap the brakes, let the FTC do its job over the next 12, 18, 24 months, let that process -- that's not going to happen. It never happens.

If you look at the history, there's never a merger -- and by "never," I mean, I think once in history -- never a merger if it has to go through the extraordinarily tortuous, serpentine, labyrinthine, what other adjective could I come up with, name for the FTC Part 3 process? It just doesn't happen. Why? Because there are 60,000 people whose jobs

are currently in limbo. There's financing that Kroger has, that C&S has, that expires if it doesn't happen quickly. There are licenses you need to procure, whether it's pharmacy or alcohol or otherwise, from state agencies. Those transfers expire, and there are 85 million families that are waiting to hear what will happen. This merger will not occur if this injunction is in place.

Let's turn to the final factor: Likelihood of success on the merits.

The fundamental question Your Honor has to ask is:
What is the chance of ultimate success? Really, what will
this merger do? Is it pro-competitive? Is it neutral? Or,
as the Government contends incorrectly, is it
anticompetitive?

And this is kind of interesting, Your Honor: There's an established framework, it's called a Baker Hughes framework, and counsel alluded to it but really didn't walk us through it, and there's a pretty profound reason why.

The first step of the Baker Hughes framework is asking the question, "Have plaintiffs properly, one, defined a product market; two, defined a geographic market; and, three, established a presumption of competitive harm?"

We're going to talk about product markets and the shell game that's going on there. But, Your Honor, you heard almost nothing about geographic market in counsel's opening statements.

Literally, she said, "I will quickly turn to it." And there's a reason that it was quickly turned to, and we'll talk about that in just a few minutes. It's because there is simply no way that plaintiffs' case, as to geographic market, stands up to the law, the facts, the industry, the circumstances, or common sense.

And if I am right in that statement, we are done. If they can't establish an appropriate geographic market that they are -- asserted market is right, then there is no likelihood of success.

But if they manage to show you, which they can't, that they've defined a proper product market and defined a proper geographic market, the burden of production, not persuasion, that always rests with the Government. The burden of proof always rests with the Government. But if the burden -- if they prove the markets, then the burden of production shifts to defendants.

Is there a way to get that purple line on the screen that I managed just --

THE COURT: No idea. Not me.

MR. WOLF: It was one hundred percent me, Your Honor. I did not mean to graffiti your screen.

THE COURT: It is okay. It's gone.

MR. WOLF: Thank you very much. The burden of

production shifts to defendants to show that there's no threat of substantial anticompetitive effect, and we'll show you just that. And I'll talk about just that in a few minutes. But at the end of the day, the burden rests with the Government to show we're wrong.

All right. Let's talk about the first step. Have plaintiffs properly defined a product market and a geographic market?

And here, Your Honor, I have to confess to a little bafflement, and we're going to be on a ride together because, in the complaint, the Government asserted the supermarket market. That's the market that excludes Amazon. That's the market -- well, in fact, both markets exclude Amazon.com, but they exclude Amazon Fresh, they exclude Costco, they exclude Whole Foods, et cetera. That was in the complaint.

Then we get Dr. Hill's expert report, and we think, aha, they've gotten slightly more reasonable with regard to the market, because he introduces the concept of a large format market; that, in terms of product, is closer to the facts on the ground. But then we get the preliminary injunction brief and the preliminary injunction reply where the Government shifts back to the supermarket market.

And then today we saw a slide with both of these markets side by side, and I can't tell whether the

Government's picked one or not.

But we're not playing a game of whack-a-mole here. The future of 60,000 employees and 85 million consumers just for one of us is on the line, and we need to know now what their alleged market is. And I ask them, when they bring Dr. Hill up, for them to say, once and for all, which one of these are they picking? But I'll tell you right now I don't know. But I'm going to show you that either one will fail in light of the evidence, the facts on the ground, and the law.

First, the supermarket market. This is the narrower one, Your Honor. This is the one that's in the pleadings. This is the one that's in the reply brief. It fails for the simple reason that it excludes real world competitors. The parties will -- the parties rely on third-party companies for data, and one of these companies provides what's called "share of wallet" and you're going to hear a lot about share of wallet in this case, and it essentially says "For your customers, the folks that actually walk into" -- in my case Kroger stores -- "what percentage of their dollar, their grocery dollar, spent is on you and is on your competitors?"

And the Government points to a world in which nearly 100 percent-- remember this one-stop shopping idea? -- nearly 100 percent must be with you, but that's not reality.

For our most loyal customers, a quarter of their spending, only a quarter, is with us. Walmart is next, then

Costco, then Albertsons, Sam's Club, and about 40 percent with other folks.

Now, what's wrong with the supermarket market? It just disregards where more than half of our customers' grocery dollars actually go. It excludes Costco. It excludes Sam's and Whole Foods and Sprouts and all the -- and Amazon and Trader Joe's and all the folks that intuitive we know -- intuitively we all know competes with Kroger, compete with Albertsons. That doesn't make any sense.

Your Honor, this is from *The New York Times* less than a week ago: How Costco Hacked the American Shopping Psyche.

More than 100 million people visit the retailer for their groceries.

The Government is asking you to ignore those 100 million people. They're asking you to say they don't count for the market. They don't put competitive pressure on us. That if we raise our price of milk by \$0.20, that those shoppers won't go to Costco and punish us for raising that price. They're saying just ignore the effect of Costco. They don't count. That doesn't make any sense. That won't make any sense in light of the evidence you're going to hear.

Similarly, with Amazon. This is a press release from a few months ago: Amazon. Our goal is to build a best in class grocery shopping experience, whether shopping in store

or online, where Amazon is the first choice for selection, value, and convenience. And the Government says in their preferred market, we shouldn't think about Amazon. That Amazon isn't relevant to whether we can raise our prices or not, whether we can decrease the quality of our products, whether our freshness, if it slips, whether there isn't someone to check us. That just doesn't jibe with the facts.

Your Honor, it's also in a bit of irony. We're, of course, against the Federal Trade Commission, an instrument of the United States Government. The FTC apparently hasn't checked notes with the Council of Economic Advisers just down the street in my hometown in D.C. This is from a press release just a few months ago. Update: Grocery price inflation has cooled substantially. Some of the most prominent grocery retailers, including Aldi, who the Government says shouldn't count for the market; Amazon, who the Government says shouldn't count for the market; Target, who they acknowledge; Walgreens, who the Government says shouldn't count for the market, recently announced price cuts.

So the very folks at the Council of Economic Advisers at the White House say are part of the market, the Government says you should disregard when deciding what the proper geographic market is in this case.

And not to gild the lily, but to gild the lily,

Your Honor, Trader Joe's? Nope. Costco? Nope. Sam's Club? Nope. Whole Foods? No. Aldi? Vallarta? H Mart? Amazon? None of them are included in the market that they asserted in the complaint.

There's another problem with the market asserted in the complaint, and that's geography and the interrelationship of geography and store in the unique complex grocery world.

You're going to hear a lot in this case about an article by Paul Ellickson, Paul Grieco, and Oleksii Khvastunov -- I practiced that last night. I don't know if I got it right -- and I again smudged the screen -- that we find, the authors find, that club stores represent significant competition -- to traditional grocers, due in large part to consumers' greater willingness to travel to them.

In other words, and in simple terms, customers, shoppers are willing to drive farther for a Costco or farther for a Target or farther for a Walmart than they are for the corner grocery store, and I think that's consistent with all of our experiences. It's certainly consistent with my household, Your Honor.

And you need to take that fact into account when you're asking about the second question, the geographic market.

Remember, product market, geographic market. They're intertwined in this industry. And what does that mean?

What the Government says is -- and their typical example is a five-mile boundary for geographic market.

That -- there -- that's the norm, the median, the mean of their -- of their geographic markets. When we're asking Albertsons, the Albertsons at the center of that circle, who's putting pressure on them so they don't raise the price of milk or eggs or bread?

First of all, they exclude Trader Joe's and Aldi and Whole Foods because they say they're outside of the product market, and we, of course, disagree with that, but they also say we're going to disregard the Costco and Walmart and Target that are just outside of the circle because they're too far away, even though the evidence shows -- and you'll hear evidence from the Government's own witnesses that customers drive farther, are willing to drive farther for these stores, and therefore these stores put price pressure on Albertsons.

If Albertsons in that circle raises the price of milk, of course customers will drive an extra quarter mile to get to a Walmart just outside of that five-mile circle.

So the narrower market fails.

And if you hold the Government or the Government insists to leaning on their narrower market, we are done here. We can go home. We can have a nice Labor Day.

Because they cannot establish likelihood of success if they

cannot establish the appropriate product and geographic market.

Let's turn, though, to Dr. Hill's large format market, which includes more of the stores that plainly compete.

The problem with Dr. Hill's market and the reason that counsel said "Let's quickly turn to geography," rather than "Let's study geography," is because Dr. Hill's market, the broader market, while better on product, fails when it comes to geography.

You heard about the hypothetical monopolist test. And, Your Honor, the hypothetical monopolist test is a check. It says, "Did you get the right market?" And how do we know if you get the right market?

If, in the market that we allege to be the right one, if you can raise prices by five percent or more, then you're a monopolist, and therefore we have the right market. If you can't, if prices are less than five percent higher, then you screwed something up. You've made a mistake. You've excluded competitors either because of product or geographic market. That's the monopolist test. It's a check. Did you get it right? And we know in the real world they got it wrong.

On the left is a representation, and you'll hear about actual markets that look exactly like this, where there are Albertsons or Kroger stores within the five-mile radius, but

Costco or Walmart stores are just outside, and therefore excluded from whatever market the Government relies on, and we can compare that in the real world markets where there are admitted competitors.

And then we ask the question. The left-hand market. The one where Costco and Walmart are just outside of the geography, and therefore the Government says they don't count, are prices higher five percent or more higher than Albertsons? And the answer is, "No, they're not." They're not statistically significantly higher at all.

And so the Government's markets, whether the narrow one or their larger one, don't just fail the hypothetical monopolist test. They fail the actual monopolist test. In the real world, Costco and Walmart and Amazon put pricing pressures at greater distances, and so you have to take that into account, and the Government doesn't.

Again, they fail.

Here's a real world example. This is from Portland,
Oregon. There's a Fred Meyer that they've drawn a five-mile
circle around, and they say that that Costco that's
sixth-tenths of a mile outside the Fred Meyer circle
shouldn't be included.

In this case, you'll hear evidence that of course it should be included. Of course it puts price pressure on that Fred Meyer; that if the Fred Meyer jacks up its prices,

people will drive to that Costco even though it's six-tenths of a mile further than the Government and the Government's witnesses suggest. But it's not just under-inclusive; bizarrely, it's also over-inclusive.

Here's the actual map the Government actually drew in Dallas, Texas. Unlike the five-mile map they thought was helpful to prove their case for Oregon, they drew a 26-mile circle in Texas. That's how broad they wanted to get it, they had to get it, to make their facts hold up, and that 26-mile circle now includes 561 total stores. It includes competitively irrelevant stores. That's the way they have to torture the data to make it sing the way they want it to.

The evidence will show that, when you define product markets correctly, when you define geographic markets correctly, this merger poses no risk, let alone a substantial risk of anticompetitive harm. In other words, they can't prove the first step. We are done.

But if we weren't, let's move on to the question of substantial anticompetitive effect.

Defendants' evidence will show definitively there is no threat of substantial anticompetitive effect. The first reason is simple. Walmart keeps prices low.

And here I'm using Walmart. A bit of a shorthand for Walmart and Amazon and Costco, but only a bit of a shorthand, because I'm going to tell you we are really,

really focused on Walmart.

You're going to see from -- hear from Mr. McMullen, the CEO; Mr. Aiken; and Andy Groff, who you're going to hear from probably tomorrow or maybe even later today, who's the senior director of pricing strategy, that Walmart is singularly focused on being the leader in price.

Kroger, in turn, is monomaniacally focused -- that's not my word. That's a word from one of the depositions. I learned it in the deposition -- on closing the gap to Walmart's prices. Simply put, Walmart at the corporate level and it all but a handful of irrelevant divisions, prices based on Walmart. Kroger based -- prices based on Walmart. And that Kroger price investment in Albertsons will narrow the Walmart price gap between Albertsons -- the current Albertsons stores and Walmart, and the evidence is unambiguous. I don't think Your Honor will be surprised when you hear from Marc Lieberman at Walmart, the Vice President of Walmart, that they believe price leadership is a critical part of their business.

And you will see document after document, you will hear witness after witness say that Walmart is the lodestar for Kroger in setting prices.

Here's an actual document: Summary of Kroger's Pricing Strategy for its Key Pricing Program.

And program after program after program, either match

Walmart's prices or stay within a band. And in yellow, there's another. Match Walmart's prices, stay within a band. We can see every place in yellow on this document. That's what monomaniacal obsession looks like. It's everything is based on Walmart.

And of course, when we invest a billion dollars annually in lower -- lowering Albertsons' prices to bring them closer to Walmart, that benefits consumers, that constrains prices, that ensures competition.

Now, what is the Government's response to this?

I asked -- I took Dr. Hill's deposition. How does your modeling take into account the prospect that Albertsons' pricing model will change to Kroger's model upon acquisition? In other words, Kroger is now going to own Albertsons. It makes common sense that the old Albertsons stores will now -- their strategy will be guided by their new owners, their new management, and Dr. Hill pushed back on that. He said, "The model looks at the current incentives which are captured in the version and the margin."

And I said, "Well, wait. What about choices made by boards of directors and senior management?"

And his response was, "Neoclassical economics assumes firms are profit maximizing."

Your Honor, this case isn't going to be decided by

neoclassical economics. This case is going to be decided by facts and executives and the law, and the executives and the facts and the law all say that Kroger will do what they say they're going to do, that the efficiencies will allow them to do what they say they're going to do, and that prices will come down for current Albertsons customers.

And when I say "the facts," I also mean history. In the last 20 years, our profit margin has gone down, down five percent, resulting in \$5 billion in savings for current Kroger customers.

When year after year -- here's a chart from our public filings. From 2006 to 2021 our margin has declined every year but three. The three crises year in that window. Every single year we brought our margin down, brought it closer to Walmart.

And when we've merged with companies, we follow the same path. In 2014 we merged with Harris Teeter. We bought prices down \$125 million annually. A 1.8 percent decline in margin.

That's what will happen with Albertsons. With Roundy's, the same thing. In 2016 we acquired them. We brought the margin down 1.1 percent. \$100 million in benefits to then Roundy's customers. The same thing will happen.

The last thing I'll say about the data, the real world

data, we actually have markets where Kroger exists and competes with other folks, but no Albertsons, and Kroger competes with Albertsons.

Remember all those slides counsel showed you of price checking Kroger and Albertsons? What's the effect of that in light of Walmart? Remember, five percent is the threshold?

The difference in prices between those markets where Albertsons exists and it doesn't, is not five percent. It's not five-tenths of one percent. It's five one-hundredths of one percent.

In the real world, that's the effect that Albertsons has on Kroger's pricing five one-hundredths of one percent. That is not substantial anticompetitive injury. In the real world, there is no threat of anticompetitive injury. In the real world, there is no threat of anticompetitive injury. In the real world, we will be bringing Albertsons' prices ever closer to Kroger's prices, ever Kroger -- ever closer to Walmart's prices.

Your Honor, we saw head-to-head slides over and over and over again, head-to-head competition. You could say that Albertsons is monomaniacally focused on Kroger. That may be true, but Kroger -- it's not reciprocated, Your Honor. It's a kind of a one-way love affair. The reason is Kroger's looking ahead, trying to catch up with Walmart.

Albertsons -- and you'll hear more from Ms. Mainigi about their financial situation. Their business situation is focused on catching up with us.

And then, if they could, which they can't, they would turn their attention to Walmart.

Albertsons is focused on us. We're focused on Walmart. What the merger will allow us to do is Kroger will get ever closer to Walmart and day by day, week by week, Kroger will bring former Albertsons stores in line with Kroger pricing and Kroger pricing collectively closer to Walmart.

Now let's talk about the neoclassical economics.

Because the real world disputes it, but it turns out the neoclassical economics also isn't right here.

Dr. Hill tells us, and I don't think there's going to be a significant dispute about this. He sets up a good standard for us. The competitive harm caused by the merger is measured by the number of stores that as a result of the merger have a CMCR value greater than five percent.

You're going to hear about CMCR, and you're going to hear about GUPPI. That distinction is Celsius and Fahrenheit for our purposes. It's not going to matter.

What does matter?

Well, the experts use the same models. They start with the diversion ratio, which is, simply, if we raise prices or someone else raises prices, how many customers vote with

their feet and go to a store nearby? And you multiply that times the variable margin. How much does that move voting with their feet cost you? What is the effect of it in dollar terms?

And the result is either CMCR or GUPPI, depending on which -- what's the numerator and what's the denominator.

Again, that's going to be a pillow fight in this case, Your Honor. You're not going to have to worry about deciding which one of those is the right way to measure things. The experts agree on this approach, but they disagree on the inputs.

And the inputs the Government and their experts choose to use are frankly a little bizarre. Dr. Hill, when it comes to diversion ratios, he derives them from market share approaches used for hospital mergers. Hospitals. A very different kind of market, a very different textured market than grocery stores.

Dr. Israel, on the other hand, uses diversions based on grocery industry-specific, that EGK, that paper I told you you're going to be hearing so much about, he uses a model from there, a well-established, well-known, and, more importantly, very appropriate model for the grocery industry.

Now, how about the other inputs? Variable margin. All the experts, indeed the entire economic community, agrees

you need to use variable margins; but, for some reason, Dr. Hill uses gross margins, whereas Dr. Israel uses variable.

Again, as to the diversion, Dr. Hill uses hospital literature. Dr. Israel uses store-level census of the grocery industry that identifies key determinants of store choice and competitive overlap in the complex setting of groceries.

In terms of the inputs, it's common sense, Your Honor. If you sell more stuff, your hourly wages go up, your costs of your employees goes up. The bags you bag the new additional groceries, that costs more. The gloves the deli workers use costs more. The cleaning products you have to use to the increased traffic costs more. Your credit card goes -- credit card fees go up, your warehousing costs go up, your transportation costs go up. All of those are real costs that really decrease your profit, and Dr. Hill ignores all of them, despite the fact that the very model he uses says you have to take into account.

Why does this matter?

You saw a very similar chart in plaintiffs' opening statement.

Dr. Hill tells us that there are 1,513 problematic stores, concerning stores, stores where the CMCR is at or above five percent. But he admits, if you take into account

variable margins, Dr. Israel's margins -- this is adapted from a chart that you're going to see that was in Dr. Hill's report. These are his own columns. He admits, if you apply variable margins, like the model suggests you have to, that 1,513 goes down to 693, or if you take into account divestitures, the divestiture of the 579 stores, that number of problematic stores goes from 1,513 to 234.

But what happens -- and for some reason Dr. Hill never does that final column on his chart -- if rather than considering how many stores are problematic, how many anticompetitive risks are there if you have divestitures or variable margins as inputs -- the proper divestiture -- what happens if you do both? What happens if you consider both the fact of the divestiture and variable margins?

The answer: If you combine Dr. Israel's margins, the correct ones, variable ones, with the divestiture, there are zero price zones of concern. There are zero price zones of concern. There is zero anticompetitive effect based on Dr. Hill's, based on the Government's own data, own analysis, own model. Zero.

So even if the Government somehow convinces you that they've chosen the right product market and the right geographic market, they cannot -- they will not be able to show you over the next three weeks any threat of substantial anticompetitive effect. There is no likelihood of success.

There is no reason to block this merger.

I want to talk briefly about the labor theory and then turn it over to my colleague Ms. Mainigi.

As I expressed to you, Your Honor, both companies,
Kroger and Albertsons, support union. The claim that there
is a unique labor union market is legally unprecedented, it
is economically unsupported, and it is factually wrong.

As to the first, this is more a subject of briefing,

Your Honor, than the evidence you're going to hear in the

case. This will be more in the post-trial briefing and what

you've seen to date. But Section 6 the Clayton Act talks

about the labor of human beings is not a commodity or

article of commerce. It's not subject to the Clayton Act.

End of story.

As for economic evidence, the experts, where is their expert testifying -- where will there be expert testimony that the union grocery labor market is a relevant antitrust market? There will be none. Where is the Government's expert testimony that the merger would substantially lessen competition in any relevant labor market?

There will be none.

Where is the evidence -- expert evidence the merger would cause a negative impact on union workers?

Again, there will be none.

And I bet you know what the next slide is going to

show. The merger -- where's the evidence the merger would reduce bargaining leverage of union workers from the experts?

There will be none.

There is no expert evidence to support the theory the Government has put forward today, nor could there be, because there is no such thing as a union grocery labor market.

To understand in simple terms, look at our workforce.

A couple of key metrics.

70 percent of Kroger-Albertsons, their first job is at the companies. 86 percent at Kroger. 97 percent at Albertsons. The jobs have no particular education requirement. 95 percent of workers are paid on an hourly basis.

What does that mean?

It means that when we're competing for workers, we're not competing against each other, primarily. We're competing against the McDonald's and the Lowe's and the Amazons, and the FedExes, and the Wawas, the Macy's and the Taco Bells of the world, that's the relevant labor market. There is no such thing as a tiny sliver called the union grocery labor market. How do we know? Well, we can look. We keep track.

First, if there were such a thing as a union grocery

labor market, you would expect that when an employee comes to Albertsons or to Kroger and they have prior work experience, that the most likely prior work experience would be at the other company or at least at another union grocery-based company. But, in fact, more than 99 percent of our current employees come from folks outside the Government's purported market. 99 percent come from UPS or Lowe's or Home Depot or stores -- or companies like that, not from the union grocery labor market, because no such market exists.

Let's flip it around. Let's say where do our employees go to when they leave us? Again, if there was a union grocery labor market, you would expect them to go to another union grocery company. But the facts say that more than 98 percent of them don't. They go to UPS or Lowe's or Home Depot or Macy's or Subway. There is no union grocery labor market.

There also -- their theory leads to bizarre results, like folks would be willing to travel seven hours to get another union labor job rather than go to their local Subway or Macy's or Amazon.

Your Honor, you heard a bit about whipsaw bargaining.
What the evidence is going to show in this trial is whatever
you think of whipsaw bargaining -- and we're actually never
going to get here because they won't be able to establish a

market -- and, Your Honor, I'm wrapping up here. I've got a few slides left.

The facts will show that a union labor force that is double its current size exercises much more leverage than one that's half its size. When the union forces of Albertsons and Kroger get together, when it's -- when they decide it's time to take a stand, they will have more influence, more leverage than they do today. This merger will be good for unions.

And, again, where the rubber meets the road, I told you before in the real world we could compare prices when Albertsons existed and when it doesn't -- when it didn't, and there was no distinction, no difference.

Well, it's the same with the labor concept. We can compare union wages where there's a Kroger but no Albertsons versus areas where there's a Kroger and an Albertsons, and we can compare union wages. And what's the difference?

None. None. There is no difference between those two markets. What does that tell us? Even if they could establish there was such a thing, which there isn't, of a union grocery market, it would have no implications. It wouldn't result in any change in wages.

Before I turn it over to Ms. Mainigi, I just want to conclude. A billion dollars a year in price investments await Albertsons' customers. \$1.3 billion in improved

```
stores and infrastructure await Albertsons' customers.
 1
 2
    billion dollars a year in union and nonunion wages and
 3
    benefits await our associates with no store closures, with
 4
    more given to the communities, no frontline job losses,
 5
    protection of union jobs, benefits to local farmers and
 6
    shoppers alike.
         Your Honor, we respectfully request you allow this
 7
 8
    merger to happen, allow it to benefit the hundreds of
    millions of folks, the 85 million families that stand to
 9
10
    gain if this merger goes through.
         Thank you for your time.
11
12
               THE COURT: Thank you.
13
              MS. MAINIGI: Your Honor, may I go up?
14
              THE COURT: Yes.
15
              MS. STEWART: Your Honor, may I approach with
    copies?
16
17
              THE COURT:
                           Yes.
18
19
                   OPENING STATEMENT FOR ALBERTSONS
20
              MS. MAINIGI: Good morning, Your Honor.
21
              THE COURT: Good morning.
22
              MS. MAINIGI: My name is Enu Mainigi, and I
    represent Albertsons. I have about 35 minutes.
23
24
               THE COURT: That's fine.
25
              MS. MAINIGI: But my goal, Your Honor, is to
```

highlight Alberstons' views of some of the upcoming points that the Court is going to consider, as well as preview some of the testimony from the Alberstons witnesses.

Now, I'm going to cover about eight separate points, and I may have a little bit of overlap with Mr. Wolf, but they really are the key points from Albertsons' perspective, especially as Your Honor considers the facts that you will hear at trial, matched up against the law.

So point one, Your Honor -- obviously, this is going to be a big focus because everybody's talking about it, and that is prices.

And we submit to you, Your Honor, that the first and most fundamental point here is that, if the merger is allowed to go through, prices will go down at Albertsons stores around the country, and I can say that with 100 percent certainty, day one.

Now, the FTC, of course, is taking the position that if two big grocery stores, like Kroger and Albertson, combine, that automatically means prices are going to go up, that that's what history tells us.

But there are multiple reasons why that will not be the case, Your Honor. Let me start with the first.

Kroger's prices are already lower than Albertsons'.

This is an undisputed fact that you will hear about at trial.

So even if all Kroger did was lower Albertsons store prices to Kroger levels, that would be a win for the Albertsons consumer.

And as you already heard from Mr. Wolf, there are plans underway, if the merger is allowed to go through, to do that.

But those price reductions, Your Honor, and certainly price reductions of that magnitude, are only going to happen if the merger goes through. Albertsons cannot provide those price reductions on its own, in the absence of a deal.

But the next reason, Your Honor, that prices will go down is scale. The Walmarts and the Targets of the world have a scale that Albertsons, and even Kroger alone, do not.

And one of the things that scale allows them to do is to buy for less and thereby sell for less.

Let me give you a real world example, Your Honor, that we deal with. In some of Albertsons' markets, we sell one type of Kraft Mac & Cheese for \$3.49. In the same markets Walmart sells the same Kraft Mac & Cheese for \$2.98.

Now, the idea that Walmart is selling a product for less than Albertsons may not be surprising, Your Honor, but this is surprising. The cost at which Albertsons can buy the Mac & Cheese is higher than the price at which Walmart can sell it.

Now, due to confidentiality reasons, Your Honor, I

can't necessarily reveal that price, but what I will represent to the Court is that starts with a 3 and falls between the price that Walmart sells it and Albertsons sells it.

And that's true not just for Mac & Cheese but for dozens, if not hundreds, of products.

So how does Walmart do that?

Scale. They do it with scale.

And the same thing with Costco. When Costco goes out and buys Cheerios, it's buying for a much larger scale of stores than Albertsons.

Costco buys more of those Cheerios in bulk at a lower cost, and it can sell them to customers at better prices, and that's a big part of what makes people want to go shop at Costco and why Albertsons is losing more and more business to them.

And of course the same is true with Amazon and others.

Right now Albertsons cannot compete with that type of scale, but the merger will give the combined company the scale to help better compete with Walmart, Costco, and Amazon.

And that's a fact that this Court should take very seriously when considering whether it would be in the public interest to enjoin this merger.

Now, one point that the FTC wants to make is, well, how

can we guarantee that a combined Kroger will keep prices low, that they won't shoot back up next year or the year after, when nobody is looking? Because the FTC says, Your Honor, that you have to assume -- assume that a combined Kroger will raise prices even beyond where they are today.

And the reason is -- Your Honor, the reason they won't is survival, and obviously you've heard a bit of that from Mr. Wolf. The combined company will not be able to survive in this world if it raises prices, and the reasons for that have everything to do with the changed competitive landscape that you will hear about at trial.

Now, why does that matter, Your Honor?

Well, one -- one of the cases that the plaintiffs actually cite again and again, and I heard it from my colleagues, is *Brown Shoe*, and *Brown Shoe* says you need to look at commercial realities. And to understand the effects of the merger, the Court needs to understand and take into account the commercial realities that Albertsons deals with every day.

Now, I do think I heard the FTC say, "Well, we are accounting for the Costcos, the Targets, the Whole Foods, the Walmarts in our economic analysis," but they have not accounted for those entities, Your Honor, in their commercial realities, and those commercial realities show

that Walmart is not going to raise its prices. Costco is not going to raise its prices. Amazon is not going to raise its prices. And other important competitors, like Target and Aldi, are not going to raise their prices.

And as these companies have told the world over and over again, their strategy is to lower prices, not raise them, and they've done so even with -- in the face of record inflation over the last several years.

And so I'll just quickly run through a few of their statements, but the first thing is a Costco earnings report from 2022. They're championing the fact that we're always trying to push more into lowering the prices.

And then there's a Target press release from May announcing that we are lowering everyday regular prices on 5,000 frequently shopped items. And then a Walmart earnings release, Your Honor, from just two weeks ago, saying that there's been real progress made related to value or lowering prices.

So this is not just a theory. Scale and low prices are actually the business models of these companies with whom Albertsons and Kroger compete.

And if they were going to raise prices, they would have done it by now. But, instead, they fight not to do that.

So if supermarkets are going to survive in this completely changed industry, they're not going to be able to

do it by raising prices. They're going to have to lower prices and keep them down.

That leads me to my second point, Your Honor, which is this: The traditional one-stop shopping supermarket is a thing of the past.

Now, Mr. Wolf referred to a tectonic shift. I'm going to refer to a seismic shift. But there has been a seismic shift in the competitive landscape, which has magnified the importance of the scale and the prices, and it's the whole reason that Albertsons is here seeking a merger, Your Honor.

But before I get into the facts, I want to take a little bit of a detour to talk about one of the key elements that the plaintiffs have the burden of proving in this case, and that is the relevant market.

And as you know, Your Honor, the FTC is claiming the relevant market here is limited -- sometimes the FTC is claiming that the relevant market here is limited to just traditional supermarkets and supercenters, and that's primarily based on their view that customers are still going to go to one store to get most of their groceries for the week.

But I want to draw Your Honor's attention to their reply brief, the recent reply brief that the plaintiffs filed, and they said something very telling in that reply brief.

The relevant antitrust question, the FTC said, is for those consumers who value a one-stop shop supermarket experience, which companies offer reasonably interchangeable substitutes for that purpose.

Now, Your Honor, I had to read that a few times to make sure that I followed along, but what they seem to be saying is that very small group of customers who might still want to engage in one-stop shopping should be the only people you look at when you decide whether this merger is good for the whole rest of the country.

Who are these consumers who only get their groceries at supermarkets and supercenters? The plaintiffs don't say, Your Honor, because they haven't actually tried to prove their market with any data about that tiny sliver of U.S. consumers, and you won't hear their experts talk about market shares in terms of consumers who want to one-stop shop. You'll hear them talk about consumers as a whole.

But for an overwhelming number of U.S. consumers, the world looks a whole lot different than it used to.

And let me turn to some of the facts that you will hear from Albertsons' witnesses at trial. So there was a time, Your Honor, when Albertsons thought of itself as a one-stop shop neighborhood supermarket, where people went once a week to buy all of their groceries. And it was certainly true back then, but it was even true 20 or 30 years ago, but it

is not the reality today.

Today, people might go to Albertsons to get some of what they need for the week, but then they're going to do their grocery shopping -- but they're also going to do their grocery shopping at Target at the same time that they might go there to get school supplies for their kids or clothing.

And depending on where they live in the country, instead of going to Target, they may go to Dollar General. At some point they may make a Costco run, and then they might stop at CVS on their way home in their neighborhood.

And then when they get home, they may realize they have forgotten a few things, and so they'll hop on Amazon or Instacart to order online.

And there's a phenomenon that this is called, Your Honor. You're going to hear witnesses refer to this as channel blurring. And that's referring to a phenomenon where retailers, who traditionally did not offer groceries, are increasingly entering and growing market share in the grocery space.

And the reason that's happening, Your Honor, is because the consumers -- the consumers are blurring the lines of where they buy groceries.

The Wall Street Journal recently wrote about this phenomenon just a few months ago, and the title of this article says it all. The title is: The Era of One-Stop

Grocery Shopping is Over.

And this article, Your Honor, points out that the average consumer bought groceries from over 20 different retailers in the last year, and that number was up 23 percent from just four years ago.

Now, do we wish that were different? Yes. But this is the reality that Albertsons faces every day. And that seismic shift that's happened has only been magnified in the last decade.

Your Honor, Albertsons' witnesses will pinpoint two especially critical moments in the last decade, moments when they've really felt the Earth move underneath their feet.

The first was October 2015, when Walmart announced several billion dollars in price reductions throughout its stores, including grocery; the second, Your Honor, was 2017, when Amazon announced it was buying Whole Foods. And the day that Amazon made that announcement, stock prices of so-called traditional grocers plummeted. And why was that? Because their space was being invaded.

Now, since that time, the retail giants have doubled down on grocery, and they show no sign of slowing down.

They have made it clear to their shareholders and the market that they view grocery as a lucrative investment.

And so, again, Your Honor, in earnings call after earnings call you will see Walmart, Amazon, and even names

that you may not have heard that often, like Dollar General, talk about the importance of grocery to their economic future.

And here's Amazon's saying that grocery is one of our fastest growing categories. Walmart telling investors that customers came to them less frequently in the past. They're now coming to them to shop more frequently. And Dollar General talking about the fact -- Dollar General talking about the fact that they're in the process of expanding many, many stores to fresh.

And of course that's also true, Your Honor, for Costco and Target and the other competitors we've mentioned.

But Walmart and Amazon and some of these others have succeeded, in part, because they've had the enormous advantage of national scale, and they leveraged that scale to gain additional consumers through lower prices.

And now they're being joined by names of other so-called nontraditional grocers that you just would not expect to see.

A startling fact, Your Honor, that we will learn about a trial is that 80 percent of the \$130 billion economic profit generated in the grocery sector since 2020 is attributable to four retailers: Amazon, Walmart, Costco, and Dollar General.

None of these are who any of us would say was a

traditional grocer a few years ago. And two of the four -Amazon and Dollar General -- are not even fully captured by
even the broadest market offered by the plaintiffs' expert
Dr. Hill. The large format market.

Now, Your Honor, let me pause on Dollar General, and you might be surprised to see it here, because I was certainly surprised to see it here, but their presence does not surprise the people at Albertsons who have been watching Dollar General's ascent for several years.

Dollar General has more than 19,000 stores, and they are aggressively expanding to offer fresh produce. Already over 3,000 of their stores carry fresh, and that number is going up to 5,000 by the end of this year.

And, by the way, Your Honor, I just want to make clear that Dollar General is different than Dollar Tree, who the FTC is bringing to testify this week at trial.

Now, Your Honor, there are other new names on the market as well. New names to many of us. Value grocery retailers, like Aldi and Lidl, who are already two of the biggest grocers worldwide, have exploded in the United States in the last several years. And Aldi, in particular, is becoming a big threat to the grocery industry.

20 years ago they only had 680 stores, and today they have 2,800, and they're just getting bigger and bigger.

They recently acquired 500 stores from Winn-Dixie.

And in March of this year they announced that they're going to invest another \$9 billion over the next five years to open 800 new stores by the end of 2028, including in states where Albertsons competes.

So today, Your Honor, these players dominate the industry, and in significant part, it's because they dominate on price. And the impact of all of these new entrants and channel blurring is that the traditional supermarkets are losing out to these large national and value players, and the data supports this fact.

As you will hear at trial, Your Honor, 20-plus years ago, in 2003, supermarket grocers were the primary choice for 79 percent of consumers for their groceries, and today that is down to 38 percent.

Now, you're going to hear, Your Honor, about all these industry shifts from Lisa Kinney, who's Albertsons VP of Customer and Market Intelligence, and she's going to tell you that she jokingly sometimes gets called the "Chief Reality Check Officer" at Albertsons because her job is to tell everyone the truth on what's happening in the industry, what the trends are, what consumers are shopping.

She's also going to talk about share of wallet, which you heard about a bit from Mr. Wolf, and share of wallet, just as a refresher, Your Honor, tries to encapsulate basically the idea that for every dollar an Albertsons

customer spends on groceries, how much do they actually spend at Albertsons?

And what Ms. Kinney will testify to, Your Honor, is that Albertsons' own customers are spending almost \$0.88 out of every dollar they have for groceries somewhere else, somewhere other than the Albertsons.

So Albertsons is losing -- or the word is "leaking" -- 88 percent of its customers grocery dollars to competitors.

And where is that 88 percent going? It's actually going to many of the same retailers that we've been talking about. The two biggest being Walmart and Costco. Albertson leaks about 15 percent of their customer share of wallet to Walmart and 12 percent to Costco. Kroger, on the other hand, Your Honor, takes about seven percent of Albertsons' share of wallet.

So when the FTC says that Kroger is our number one competitor, that's not what the data shows.

Now, the FTC will be able to show you some cherry-picked documents where we are monitoring Kroger's price or going back and forth about Kroger pricing in some way. There's going to be documents about that. But for every document they show you that mentions Kroger, there are five others that mention Walmart and Aldi and Costco and Target.

And Albertsons' witnesses will tell you some of the

focus on Kroger is explained by the fact that for a long time there was actually not readily available data on the big competitors that we've been talking about. There was not data available as to who was shopping at Costco, for example.

Now, one of the ways, Your Honor, that the FTC responds to what our witnesses have to say about the changed competitive landscape is to say that a lot of the big competitors that Albertsons now faces are not important.

Because even if Albertsons' customers go somewhere like a Costco for some things, like toothpaste, they're still going to just get about everything else from their neighborhood supermarket.

And I believe one of the ways that Ms. Musser illustrated that was the Gatorade/water example.

But Ms. Kinney is going to explain to you why that's wrong. Her team has looked at this exact question, and she calls it the toothpaste phenomenon. And here's what that means: There was a time when Albertsons' customers might go to Costco or Target or Dollar General to buy basic goods, like toothpaste, toilet paper, at a lower price, but they would return to Albertsons to buy their tomatoes, their milk, and their deli meats. But what Ms. Kinney's team has discovered is that when the customer goes to buy the toothpaste or the toilet paper at the cheaper store, they

often end up staying and buying their tomatoes and everything else there as well.

So the FTC may come in here with its maps and its circles and its charts, but the commercial reality,

Your Honor, is that Albertsons' competitors are all of these different retailers who are taking money out of Albertsons' customers' wallets.

Now, the third key point, Your Honor, that I would like you to understand through this trial and our witnesses is that Albertsons explored other alternatives before we got to this point.

We did not arrive at the idea of a merger lightly. We made tremendous efforts to compete with all of these competitors that I've been discussing and that Mr. Wolf discussed before we arrived at the merger as our best opportunity for long-term competitiveness.

And there's going to be an interesting dynamic at this trial, which I think we've already seen, because at the same time you'll be hearing from Albertsons' employees about how difficult it has been to compete in this changing industry. The FTC may talk about how great Albertsons is. They'll take documents out of context and suggest Albertsons is crushing it against Kroger, against Walmart, and has successfully brought down prices.

Now, the evidence at trial, Your Honor, will be that

Albertsons has tried to lower the costs at which it buys goods, and it has tried to lower the prices it charges customers, and you're going to hear about various initiatives that they've undertaken to do so, and these initiatives were designed to lower costs and achieve what they needed to achieve without making the kind of huge structural change that comes with a merger.

And you'll hear from Albertsons' witnesses, Your Honor, that those efforts, and others like them, have had success around the margins. They've taken costs down, but a lot of those costs, those saved costs, have been offset by rising prices and other things.

And over the last five years, in particular, it has become clear, Your Honor, that Albertsons cannot compete on price with these giants that have true national scale.

Now, if you ask the people at Albertsons, "Do you want to merge with Kroger?" And if you ask that question in a vacuum, they would say, "No. Of course not."

Who would want to be the company being acquired? This is a company that was founded in 1939 and still bears the name of its founder, Joe Albertson, and some of their banners have been around even longer. 160 years.

But if you can't even by the Kraft Mac & Cheese for the price that Walmart sells it at, there's a limit to what you're going to be able to do.

And so after taking a look at all of their options,
Albertsons reluctantly made clear to the market that it was
interested in strategic partnerships in 2022. And the
option that presented itself and that actually turned out to
make a lot of sense was Kroger, as the evidence will show.

And if you look at the map, Your Honor, Kroger is in a lot of places where Albertsons isn't, and Albertsons is in a lot of places where Kroger isn't. So by combining these two companies, we'll not only get the scale of a much bigger company but also a national footprint that is complementary.

Now, Your Honor, let me take a detour for a minute.

Because one thing you might wonder about this national footprint point, which has been made by Mr. Wolf, and you'll hear through this trial, is, "Well, if Albertsons can't compete effectively without national scale, then how do some of these regional supermarkets do it, like H-E-B in Texas or Publix in Florida? How do they do it so well?"

And one of the most important differences for those regional players, Your Honor, is density.

So if you spent any time in Texas, you might have noticed that there's an H-E-B nearly at every corner, and that density gives them the advantages in their supply chain and distribution network that Albertsons, which is more dispersed throughout the country, as you can see, just does not have.

And one way to think about it, Your Honor, is that Albertsons is too big to be an H-E-B but too small to be a Walmart; but by combining with Kroger, Albertsons will be able to get more of that density nationally so it can compete better with all of these other national players who already have the benefit of the national scale.

So, Your Honor, my fourth point is this: What does Albertsons do? What does Albertsons look like if there is no merger?

And this point goes directly to one of the issues

Your Honor must consider, whether issuing an injunction

would be in the public interest, and here it would not be in

the public interest, Your Honor, because Albertsons' backup

plan, if the merger were enjoined, would be worse for

consumers, worse for employees, and worse for competition in

the long-term.

You're going to hear at this trial, Your Honor, next week from Albertsons CEO, Vivek Sankaran, who's here with us today, and he'll be testifying next week, I believe. He joined the company in 2019 to help tackle the challenges that it was facing competitively.

And as you'll hear, he and Albertsons have done everything they can to try to set this company up for long-term success, but what they ultimately realized is that the merger is best thing for the company, its customers, and

its employees.

And he'll explain to you that if this merger doesn't happen, of course the company will regroup and try to compete and deliver value to its customers, associates, and shareholders, and he and other Albertsons witnesses will tell you, "We will do our best, and the next two to four years will be okay, but there are limits to what we can accomplish without the scale."

And he'll tell you that it will be difficult to compete against the Goliaths who do have scale, like Walmart and Costco, Target, and Amazon. These companies are always going to have an incredible advantage on reducing costs and buying at scale and, therefore, reducing prices for consumers.

Mr. Sankaran will also tell you that, because of the seismic shifts in the industry, if a go-it-alone Albertsons is going to have a chance of competing effectively,

Your Honor, it will need to fundamentally change its cost structure, and that could mean taking a hard look at a few different options. It could mean layoffs. It could include closing stores. It may include exiting certain markets altogether. These are the kind of things that are on the table if the merger does not go through, and we recognize as a company the disruption that happens at the community level and the impact on our customers, our employees, their

families, and the broader community with these kinds of changes, and we hope we don't have to get there.

And, of course, if somehow Albertsons does not succeed in those kind of measures, then it likely -- the likelihood is that it is a candidate for a sale to somebody else. And that's why, Mr. Sankaran will tell you, that it will be an incredible loss for American consumers, Albertsons employees, and the communities that Albertsons serves if this merger doesn't go through.

You're going to hear his enthusiasm for the merger, because after spending years working hard to reduce costs so that Albertsons can deliver price reductions to customers and higher wages to its employees, he will tell you that this merger will make those changes possible by bringing together two complementary companies that have the combined wherewithal to do what Albertsons cannot do alone.

So let me shift gears again, Your Honor, for my fifth and sixth points, and let me touch briefly on a couple of the benefits of the merger that you'll hear about at trial that I haven't talked about yet. Obviously, we've talked about price reductions.

But as you heard from Mr. Wolf, the merger will also bring benefits in terms of investments in employee wages and store improvements, that Albertsons is not going to be able to achieve but for the merger, and let me take those one at a time.

So the first of these is the impact on our store associates and their wages. Kroger has pledged that it won't close any stores or distribution centers or manufacturing facilities or lay off any frontline associates as a result of the merger. And on top of that, it has pledged that it will invest in employee wages and benefits. Albertsons cannot make those same commitments on its own.

And, obviously, there are other options that may be on the table if the merger does not go through.

Now, in addition to those points, Mr. Sankaran is going to come in and add another layer to this conversation because he's going to talk about the fact that Albertsons and Kroger are both large union employers.

Now, this matters, obviously, Your Honor, from an antitrust perspective, because the plaintiffs have tried to suggest that one reason Your Honor should enjoin this merger is because it's supposedly going to hurt union employees by causing unions to lose their leverage. That's their harm in the labor market theory.

But the reality is the opposite, Your Honor. This merger is going to protect union jobs and make two of the only handful of union grocery store employers stronger.

There's no way plaintiffs can show harm in a labor market.

And that will be discussed by Albertsons' witnesses at

trial.

But you know who does not have union labor or very little union labor? Walmart, Amazon, and Costco. And that's why we struggle to understand any union opposition to this merger, because, in fact, this merger presents an opportunity to reverse the multi-decade shift that we've been seeing to shrinking union jobs.

The other point, Your Honor, my sixth point, is that, if the merger does go through, Kroger is going to invest over a billion dollars in store improvements.

Now, store improvements may not sound like a big deal, but they are a win-win-win for the customers and the employees and the communities around the stores. And we all know that it's -- to be able to walk into a grocery store with a nice layout, a nice setup, clean, well-stocked product displays, is a pleasure, and that is what we are trying to achieve with the merger. It matters to the consumers who shop there. It matters to the associates who work there, and it matters to the neighbors who live there.

And it's just one more benefit, Your Honor, that frankly is not going to be achievable without the merger.

Seventh, Your Honor, I want to shift gears to the divestiture and talk about why C&S is set up for success, and Albertsons has a perspective on the divestitures because most of the stores that would be going as part of the

divestiture are Albertsons' stores, and, of course, the people who work there are our people.

The plaintiffs are trying to claim that C&S will fail and it does not know how to operate stores, and they make three basic points in a variety of ways.

Let me try to take some of those points on right now, Your Honor.

One of the points that we've heard made by the FTC, and we think they'll continue making, is that 579 stores, the number of stores being divested, is not enough for C&S to make a go of it, that that is not enough scale. But what the FTC is forgetting, Your Honor, and that you will learn about at trial, is that C&S has something that neither Kroger nor Albertsons has right now. It has national scale.

And specifically what it has is a distribution network that services 7,500 stores nationwide, and what that means is when those stores want frozen food or cereal or some other product category, C&S is the one that acquires it and C&S is the one that puts it in the store.

Now, by supporting 7,500 grocery stores, C&S is actually bigger than Kroger and Albertsons combined from both a distribution standpoint and a buying standpoint right now.

And Mr. Sankaran will tell you he wishes he had C&S's supply chain scale and distribution power.

And you'll learn at this trial, Your Honor, that there are times when the price at which C&S can get a product to our store is cheaper than Albertsons can get it there by itself.

Now, the next thing, Your Honor, the FTC will say is that C&S isn't getting the right assets, as part of this merger, to be competitive, and that is incorrect also.

Let me run through briefly some of the significant assets C&S is getting from Albertsons, and of course they'll be discussed at trial.

From Albertsons alone, they are getting ownership of our Haggen and Carr banners and exclusive perpetual licenses to our Albertsons and Safeway banners in certain states, Your Honor.

And this is important because these are names that customers know and have positive associations with today, and C&S will be able to use those banners to retain and grow their customers.

They're getting ownership of or licenses to a whole bunch of private label brands, Your Honor, with loyal followings. They're getting Open Nature, Signature Select, and O Organics, and you're going to hear about those at trial. And then there's the tech stack that C&S is getting from Albertsons.

And at trial, Albertsons' employees will testify about

the plans they've been executing to ensure that C&S is ready on day one from a technology standpoint, and that includes giving C&S a clone of Albertsons IT system that will allow all of the divested stores to run on the same system that the Albertsons stores run on today.

Now, Your Honor, as far as people resources, C&S is getting all of the frontline employees of Albertsons stores and distribution centers that are being divested. So what that means is that all of the same people who are running those stores, the same people you see at the checkout line the day before the divestiture will be there the day after the divestiture also.

C&S is also getting, as Your Honor heard, Susan Morris, who is currently Albertsons' Chief Operating Officer, and has signed on to become CEO of C&S retail if the divestiture happens, and Ms. Morris is here with us today.

Ms. Morris has spent her entire career, more than 39 years, in the retail grocery industry, and almost all of that time has been at Albertsons. She's worked through multiple grocery store mergers, and she's uniquely qualified to help C&S grow and thrive because she has done exactly that with Albertsons previously.

In 2010, Your Honor, Albertsons was a 200-store company, and in the span of five years, Ms. Morris has helped it grow into a 2,000-store company. And she's

already spent months conferring with C&S and planning for how to be ready on day one.

And she won't go there alone. Many of the senior leadership who are running the divisions Ms. Morris oversees now would come with her to C&S in the event of a -- of a divestiture.

Now, Your Honor, I think we've already heard the FTC begin to focus on something called the Haggen divestiture, which was associated with the Safeway merger. They're going to want to characterize that as a failure and say that this divestiture will be Haggen 2.0, but you are going to hear from Albertsons' witnesses that this divestiture and the Haggen are nowhere near the same.

Now, the biggest issue with that divestiture,
Your Honor, was that Haggen bought grocery stores, but the
people who are ultimately calling the shots and running the
stores were not grocers.

So they made a number of mistakes in terms of rebannering, now they approached the supply chain, and how they ran the business; but that's not what we have here with Ms. Morris and the talented people that she's bringing with her from Albertsons, if this divestiture goes through, who are going to apply their decades of industry knowledge and experience to help make C&S a success.

I think that there were some reference by Ms. Hall to

rebannering and -- and abrupt rebannering, and Ms. Morris will discuss the concept of rebannering and the different ways, for example, that you can mitigate a change of name, and she's got a lot of ideas as to how to do that; but, more importantly, she's got the experience in already doing that.

Your Honor, for my final point, I want to briefly address the stakes involved and why time is of the essence.

I know we heard from the FTC that it was not; but, respectfully, we disagree.

The FTC is going to continue to try to tell you that this whole trial is just a prelude to the main event, their administrative hearing, and that may be how the FTC would like the world to be; but the reality is, Your Honor, that the outcome of this hearing is going to most certainly be dispositive of whether this merger goes through or not.

Mergers are fragile things, and what you decide is going to determine what happens to these two companies.

Now, the plaintiffs will also say to the Court that you can just freeze things in time, preserve the status quo, by granting the injunction; but as you will hear at trial, Your Honor, the status quo is just not going to be an option for Albertsons. Change is coming one way or another for this company, and it's for that reason, Your Honor, why we're hoping, not just for a timely decision, but also a decision that allows this merger to bring the benefits that

I've described to customers, employees, and the communities. Thank you very much for your time, Your Honor. THE COURT: Thank you. So we're going to take a short recess. I would encourage counsel to check in so they'll know where they are timewise, and we'll start up again at 1:00. It's going to be a quick lunch. MS. MAINIGI: Thank you, Your Honor. (Morning session concluded at 12:38 PM.)

1 CERTIFICATE 2 3 Federal Trade Commission v. Kroger, et al. 3:24-cv-00347-AN4 5 Preliminary Injunction Hearing - Day 1 - AM Session 6 August 26, 2024 7 I certify, by signing below, that the foregoing is 8 a true and correct transcript of the record, taken by 9 stenographic means, of the proceedings in the above-entitled 10 11 cause. A transcript without an original signature, conformed signature, or digitally signed signature is not 12 13 certified. 14 15 /s/Jill L. Jessup, CSR, RMR, RDR, CRR, CRC 16 Signature Date: 8/26/2024 Official Court Reporter CSR Expiration Date: 9/30/2026 17 Oregon CSR No. 98-0346 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25

DEPUTY COURTROOM CLERK: [2] 7/4 82/21 MR. ANDERSON: [16] 8/11 11/9 11/16 11/21 12/1 12/5 12/11 12/19 13/13 13/16 16/10 17/15 17/18 17/20 17/24 18/14 MR. DICKINSON: [1] 8/7 MR. HERRERA: [1] 8/17 MR. KAYSER: [1] 8/12 MR. MORIARTY: [1] 10/10 MR. NORD: [1] 8/15 MR. OBARO: [3] 9/20 13/19 13/21 MR. PAI: [1] 8/9 MR. PERRY: [8] 9/17 22/4 22/13 22/20 22/24 30/1 30/22 31/1 MR. PODOLL: [7] 14/7 14/15 15/4 15/8 15/19 17/1 17/14 MR. TUCKER: [1] 8/22 MR. WARREN: [1] 9/3 MR. WOLF: [13] 9/8 9/14 9/19 9/22 18/11 32/12 82/14 82/19 82/24 83/2 83/5 101/22 101/25 MR. YOUNG: [1] 8/20	\$1.35 [1] 96/12 \$100 [1] 113/22 \$125 [1] 113/18 \$130 [1] 133/21 \$2.98 [1] 125/19 \$21,000 [1] 97/18 \$220 [1] 37/11 \$247 [1] 89/5 \$25 [2] 34/21 89/15 \$3.49 [1] 125/18 \$5 [1] 113/9 \$70 [1] 36/4 \$73 [1] 57/19 \$9 [1] 135/2 	10th [1] 2/22 110 [1] 72/10 11000 [1] 2/18 115 [1] 3/3 1162 [1] 3/20 12 [4] 85/2 85/3 99/18 136/13 121 [2] 3/17 5/3 1217 [1] 27/11 1225 [1] 27/11 128 [1] 89/15 12:38 [1] 151/8 13 [3] 76/23 79/18 79/18 13th [1] 32/8 15 [1] 136/12 15-minute [1] 82/18 160 [1] 139/22 162 [1] 27/16 163 [1] 27/4 168 [1] 27/4 168 [1] 99/18 180 [1] 93/7 1883 [1] 86/5 19,000 [1] 134/10 1918 [1] 92/19 1939 [1] 139/20 1:00 [1] 151/6 1st [1] 35/22
MS. GORDON: [1] 9/1 MS. HALL: [20] 8/5 18/17 19/3 19/12 19/15 19/18 20/8 20/12 21/16 21/18 21/22 22/1 25/16 25/18 25/25 26/12 26/15 26/17 31/9 66/3 MS. HESSE: [10] 22/25 23/2 24/6 24/11 25/2 25/4 25/6 25/9 25/23 28/14 MS. MAINIGI: [12] 9/24 10/5 10/8 10/12 10/16 16/1 32/13 123/13 123/20 123/22 123/25 151/7 MS. MUSSER: [8] 8/1 11/4 32/11 32/16 32/20 32/24 33/3 33/13 MS. STEWART: [1] 123/15 MS. TORRES PAEZ: [1] 8/24 MS. WEBER: [1] 9/6 THE COURT: [83]	1,002 [1] 70/9 1,472 [1] 58/2 1,513 [3] 117/23 118/5 118/7 1,700 [1] 83/12 1,725 [1] 37/5 1,922 [1] 57/17 1.1 [1] 113/22 1.2 [1] 97/22 1.8 [1] 113/18 1/75th [1] 64/9 10 [5] 84/12 85/2 85/3 88/14 91/13 10-K [1] 41/7 10-Ks [1] 41/7 100 [2] 103/22 124/15 100 million [2] 104/12 104/15 100 percent [1] 103/23 100,000 [1] 38/8 1000 [1] 5/20 1014 [1] 4/17	2 2,000-store [1] 148/25 2,200 [3] 37/4 37/5 90/17 2,257 [1] 37/1 2,700 [2] 37/1 86/9 2,800 [1] 134/24 2.0 [1] 149/11 20 [7] 85/3 85/13 93/6 113/8 130/25 132/3 134/23 20-plus [1] 135/11 200 [3] 3/6 93/5 93/6 200-store [1] 148/23 2000 [1] 57/5 20001 [2] 2/22 4/12 2001 [1] 4/14 20024 [2] 2/5 5/10 2003 [7] 89/1 89/4 89/13 89/15 89/18 89/22 135/12 20036 [1] 4/14 2005 [1] 27/12 2006 [1] 113/12
MS. HALL: [20] 8/5 18/17 19/3 19/12 19/15 19/18 20/8 20/12 21/16 21/18 21/22 22/1 25/16 25/18 25/25 26/12 26/15 26/17 31/9 66/3 MS. HESSE: [10] 22/25 23/2 24/6 24/11 25/2 25/4 25/6 25/9 25/23 28/14 MS. MAINIGI: [12] 9/24 10/5 10/8 10/12 10/16 16/1 32/13 123/13 123/20 123/22 123/25 151/7 MS. MUSSER: [8] 8/1 11/4 32/11 32/16 32/20 32/24 33/3 33/13 MS. STEWART: [1] 123/15 MS. TORRES PAEZ: [1] 8/24 MS. WEBER: [1] 9/6 THE COURT: [83] \$ 0.20 [1] 104/17 \$0.88 [1] 136/4 \$1 [2] 64/3 83/21	1,002 [1] 70/9 1,472 [1] 58/2 1,513 [3] 117/23 118/5 118/7 1,700 [1] 83/12 1,725 [1] 37/5 1,922 [1] 57/17 1.1 [1] 113/22 1.2 [1] 97/22 1.8 [1] 113/18 1/75th [1] 64/9 10 [5] 84/12 85/2 85/3 88/14 91/13 10-K [1] 41/7 10-Ks [1] 41/7 100 [2] 103/22 124/15 100 million [2] 104/12 104/15 100 percent [1] 103/23 100,000 [1] 38/8 1000 [1] 5/20 1014 [1] 4/17 10153 [1] 4/8 107 [1] 39/6 107-year-old [1] 85/21	2 2,000-store [1] 148/25 2,200 [3] 37/4 37/5 90/17 2,257 [1] 37/1 2,700 [2] 37/1 86/9 2,800 [1] 134/24 2.0 [1] 149/11 20 [7] 85/3 85/13 93/6 113/8 130/25 132/3 134/23 20-plus [1] 135/11 200 [3] 3/6 93/5 93/6 200-store [1] 148/23 2000 [1] 57/5 20001 [2] 2/22 4/12 2001 [1] 4/14 20024 [2] 2/5 5/10 2003 [7] 89/1 89/4 89/13 89/15 89/18 89/22 135/12 20036 [1] 4/14 2005 [1] 27/12
MS. HALL: [20] 8/5 18/17 19/3 19/12 19/15 19/18 20/8 20/12 21/16 21/18 21/22 22/1 25/16 25/18 25/25 26/12 26/15 26/17 31/9 66/3 MS. HESSE: [10] 22/25 23/2 24/6 24/11 25/2 25/4 25/6 25/9 25/23 28/14 MS. MAINIGI: [12] 9/24 10/5 10/8 10/12 10/16 16/1 32/13 123/13 123/20 123/22 123/25 151/7 MS. MUSSER: [8] 8/1 11/4 32/11 32/16 32/20 32/24 33/3 33/13 MS. STEWART: [1] 123/15 MS. TORRES PAEZ: [1] 8/24 MS. WEBER: [1] 9/6 THE COURT: [83] \$ \$0.20 [1] 104/17 \$0.88 [1] 136/4	1,002 [1] 70/9 1,472 [1] 58/2 1,513 [3] 117/23 118/5 118/7 1,700 [1] 83/12 1,725 [1] 37/5 1,922 [1] 57/17 1.1 [1] 113/22 1.2 [1] 97/22 1.8 [1] 113/18 1/75th [1] 64/9 10 [5] 84/12 85/2 85/3 88/14 91/13 10-K [1] 41/7 10-Ks [1] 41/11 100 [2] 103/22 124/15 100 million [2] 104/12 104/15 100 percent [1] 103/23 100,000 [1] 38/8 1000 [1] 5/20 1014 [1] 4/17 10153 [1] 4/8 107 [1] 39/6	2 2,000-store [1] 148/25 2,200 [3] 37/4 37/5 90/17 2,257 [1] 37/1 2,700 [2] 37/1 86/9 2,800 [1] 134/24 2.0 [1] 149/11 20 [7] 85/3 85/13 93/6 113/8 130/25 132/3 134/23 20-plus [1] 135/11 200 [3] 3/6 93/5 93/6 200-store [1] 148/23 2000 [1] 57/5 20001 [2] 2/22 4/12 2001 [1] 4/14 20024 [2] 2/5 5/10 2003 [7] 89/1 89/4 89/13 89/15 89/18 89/22 135/12 20036 [1] 4/14 2005 [1] 27/12 2006 [1] 113/12 201 [1] 4/5 2010 [1] 148/23

2	4,961 [1] 38/11	8
-	40 [3] 77/19 89/1 104/1	
2015 [1] 132/13	400 [4] 2/5 2/13 2/22 5/3	8/26/2024 [1] 152/16
2016 [1] 113/21	408 [1] 3/14	80 percent [1] 133/21
2017 [1] 132/15	413 [1] 66/13	800 [1] 135/3
2019 [1] 141/20	414,000 [1] 37/2	82002 [1] 3/24
2020 [2] 76/23 133/22		83 [1] 87/25
2021 [1] 113/12	45202 [1] 4/18	85 [2] 100/5 103/3
2022 [3] 90/18 128/11 140/3	455 [1] 2/18	85 million [1] 123/9
2023 [5] 76/20 89/2 89/13 89/15	48 [3] 14/17 15/5 18/9	85701 [1] 2/14
89/22	49 [1] 20/16	86 [1] 120/12
	4:15 p.m [1] 27/7	
2024 [4] 1/6 7/2 152/6 152/16		87501 [1] 3/15
2026 [1] 152/17	5	88 [1] 136/9
2028 [1] 135/3	5,000 [3] 37/9 128/15 134/13	88 percent [1] 136/8
204 [1] 3/10	5,300 [1] 89/2	89148 [1] 3/11
20580 [1] 2/9	500 [2] 65/17 134/25	8945 [1] 3/10
21202 [1] 3/7	51 percent [1] 71/1	0
215 [1] 2/13	52 [1] 37/10	9
22 [2] 37/14 39/15		9 percent [1] 71/1
23 percent [1] 132/5	551 [1] 70/10	9/30/2026 [1] 152/17
234 [1] 118/7	561 [1] 110/10	90 [1] 83/13
24 [1] 99/18	579 [3] 66/4 118/6 146/9	94065 [1] 4/5
26 [3] 1/6 7/2 152/6	59 percent [1] 39/18	94102 [1] 2/18
	6	95 [1] 120/14
26-mile [2] 110/7 110/10		97 percent [1] 120/12
27 [1] 38/24	6.5 billion [1] 88/12	97204 [3] 3/18 5/3 5/20
278 [1] 39/22	60 [1] 39/1	97205 [1] 4/3
28 [1] 86/10	60 percent [2] 70/25 89/3	
285,000 [1] 37/6	60,000 [3] 94/23 99/25 103/3	97301 [1] 3/21
286 [1] 73/23	600 [5] 2/9 4/14 83/14 89/20	98 [1] 121/14
3	94/5	98-0346 [1] 152/17
-	601 [1] 4/11	99 [3] 56/16 121/5 121/7
3,000 [3] 93/4 97/25 134/12	60603 [1] 3/3	9:00 [1] 31/24
3,400 [1] 89/2	63 billion [1] 89/4	9th [2] 27/3 27/15
3.5 [1] 88/10	66 [1] 37/9	^
30 [3] 27/14 77/18 130/25	669 [1] 39/8	<u>A</u>
30 percent [2] 76/21 77/15	680 [2] 5/9 134/23	ability [6] 17/12 21/23 46/19
30-day [1] 27/13		62/11 71/19 82/10
3000 [1] 4/2	693 [1] 118/5	able [26] 7/20 11/7 11/22 13/4
301 [1] 5/20	6th [2] 2/22 26/18	23/18 29/4 29/16 32/4 34/17
318 [1] 89/13	7	36/7 59/2 60/2 63/19 66/15
33 [1] 38/23		88/11 93/14 118/23 121/25
34 [2] 37/6 97/2	7,000 [1] 19/13	127/9 128/25 136/18 139/25
	7,500 [8] 85/22 92/24 94/5 98/8	141/4 143/24 145/14 147/17
35 [4] 37/2 86/9 90/17 123/23	98/22 99/3 146/16 146/20	about [144]
36 [1] 89/22	7.7 [1] 30/12	about [144] above [4] 45/5 45/22 117/25
37 [1] 39/15	70 percent [1] 120/11	152/10
38 percent [1] 135/14	700 [1] 3/17	
39 [1] 148/17	710,000 [2] 34/15 37/12	above-entitled [1] 152/10
397 [1] 27/11	75th [1] 64/9	abrupt [1] 150/1
3:24-cv-00347-AN [2] 1/4 152/4	760 [1] 4/2	absence [1] 125/10
4	767 [1] 4/7	absent [3] 43/15 46/17 61/19
	79 percent [4] 42/25 43/3 56/18	absolute [1] 81/8
4,000 [2] 37/9 37/9	135/13	absolutely [4] 8/4 19/17 21/25
4,500 [1] 94/5	7th [1] 2/5	32/19

Α

abysmal [1] 71/22

accepted [1] 21/3

accessible [1] 98/4

accompanied [1] 27/17

accomplish [1] 142/8

81/20 98/19

access [5] 47/23 63/13 80/11

account [9] 42/25 58/19 106/22

109/16 112/12 117/19 117/25

118/5 127/19 accounted [2] 59/9 127/24 accounting [3] 36/4 70/11 127/22 accounts [1] 59/8 accurate [1] 31/6 achievable [1] 145/21 achieve [4] 139/5 139/6 143/25 145/17 achieved [1] 63/5 acknowledge [4] 24/25 85/14 94/11 105/18 acknowledged [1] 72/25 acknowledges [2] 74/5 97/2 acknowledging [1] 15/23 acquire [3] 23/10 67/7 77/3 acquired [8] 20/10 20/14 36/21 36/21 73/16 113/21 134/25 139/19 acquires [2] 72/17 146/18 acquiring [3] 19/21 68/1 97/24 acquisition [28] 34/23 37/23 38/24 39/6 39/17 41/22 43/15 46/12 46/21 49/12 56/10 59/20 61/23 64/8 64/10 64/13 65/3 65/25 66/7 66/18 66/21 67/4 70/10 77/24 79/21 81/23 89/19 112/14 acquisitions [2] 36/22 36/24 across [19] 33/16 34/2 34/15 34/16 36/17 36/23 37/6 38/2 39/11 40/10 40/13 41/9 42/20 49/8 55/16 69/14 73/14 74/16 81/4 act [7] 79/19 79/24 81/10 81/11 85/14 119/11 119/13 action [3] 44/14 44/25 46/11 active [1] 24/22 actively [1] 25/10 acts [1] 35/12 actual [4] 108/24 109/13 110/5 111/23

actually [15] 16/24 78/8 103/18 104/5 110/5 114/1 121/24 127/15 128/20 130/13 136/1 136/9 137/2 140/4 146/21 ad [1] 47/23 **Adam [1]** 5/6 adapted [1] 118/1 add [1] 144/12 addition [5] 46/22 47/21 71/3 93/11 144/11 additional [8] 45/1 48/20 53/6 71/5 84/6 84/9 117/12 133/16 address [12] 7/24 18/2 18/4 20/11 26/6 26/7 27/3 32/10 64/2 66/3 90/2 150/7 addressing [1] 71/8 adds [1] 50/15 adjective [1] 99/23 adjudication [2] 35/17 82/9 admin [1] 44/8 administrative [10] 11/14 35/16 61/7 66/12 79/3 79/8 80/6 82/1 82/7 150/12 admit [1] 14/13 admits [2] 117/25 118/3 admitted [3] 14/25 61/17 109/4 ado [1] 58/18 **ADRIENNE [1]** 1/17 ads [2] 48/3 48/6 advance [5] 14/17 15/6 15/10 16/13 18/9 advantage [2] 133/15 142/12 advantages [2] 72/14 140/22 Advisers [2] 105/11 105/21 **Advisor [1]** 43/9 **Adwea [2]** 5/8 10/12 **affair [1]** 114/24 affect [2] 15/17 20/25 affected [4] 72/1 77/14 77/15 77/19 **affecting [1]** 58/16 **affects [1]** 70/13 affirmatively [2] 14/12 18/2 affordable [1] 33/21 after [38] 13/17 26/5 28/24 28/25 29/4 29/5 29/13 38/4 38/8 39/11 39/17 53/2 53/2 57/16 66/8 74/23 76/11 79/12 83/6 87/22 87/22 94/13 94/25 95/9 95/9 95/12 95/21 95/25 111/20 111/21 111/25 111/25 113/11 127/3 132/24 140/1 143/11

148/11 afternoon [3] 22/21 26/2 28/11 again [29] 36/18 39/20 39/22 43/13 43/22 45/17 56/3 56/25 63/9 82/2 89/16 89/23 92/21 95/5 97/18 106/11 109/17 114/21 116/7 117/4 119/24 121/12 122/10 127/15 127/15 128/6 132/24 143/17 151/6 against [23] 34/18 43/17 44/21 45/7 46/11 46/16 47/17 50/23 64/18 64/23 65/5 71/19 81/6 91/9 91/12 99/4 105/9 120/18 120/19 124/8 138/23 138/23 142/10 agencies [2] 79/20 100/4 aggressive [1] 43/8 aggressively [2] 75/9 134/11 ago [12] 31/19 96/1 104/11 104/24 105/13 128/16 130/25 131/24 132/5 134/1 134/23 135/12 agree [2] 13/22 116/10 agreement [22] 11/17 12/6 14/3 14/8 15/3 15/4 15/14 26/20 27/2 28/2 28/25 29/2 30/7 30/9 60/9 73/23 74/10 75/7 79/10 84/14 92/13 95/4 agreements [2] 78/7 95/7 agrees [1] 116/25 **aha [1]** 102/18 ahead [5] 16/25 17/19 20/11 46/4 114/25 Aiken [1] 111/3 aimed [1] 35/9 Aitken [2] 87/1 87/16 al [3] 1/3 7/7 152/3 **Alaska [2]** 46/24 74/3 **Alberstons** [1] 124/3 **Alberstons' [1]** 124/1 **Alberts [1]** 36/19 **Albertson [5]** 38/21 47/3 124/18 136/11 139/21 ALBERTSONS [202] Albertsons' [43] 34/18 41/7 42/8 42/15 42/19 42/25 43/11 43/23 44/17 46/1 48/3 60/23 61/3 64/11 84/25 85/3 90/14 97/20 112/7 112/12 114/17 122/25 123/1 124/6 124/23 125/17 130/21 132/10 136/4 136/14 136/25 137/10 137/19

Albertsons'... [10] 138/5 138/6 138/19 139/8 141/13 144/25 146/1 147/25 148/14 149/12 alcohol [1] 100/4 Aldi [9] 90/5 95/14 105/15 106/2 107/8 128/4 134/19 134/21 136/23 Aldi's [1] 54/25 alert [1] 22/15 **alerts [1]** 43/12 align [1] 60/18 aligned [1] 14/1 alike [1] 123/6 all [90] allegations [1] 69/14 allege [1] 108/14 alleged [2] 97/5 103/5 allegedly [1] 65/9 allow [15] 7/17 23/15 25/19 25/20 29/24 61/2 63/2 69/19 92/7 94/9 113/4 115/7 123/7 123/8 148/3 allowed [9] 7/16 38/25 41/23 46/12 46/18 50/2 84/18 124/14 allowing [3] 12/20 79/21 86/22 allows [2] 125/14 150/25 alluded [1] 100/17 almost [5] 89/23 91/5 100/25 136/4 148/18 **Alona [1]** 68/2 alone [10] 38/11 49/9 75/14 90/4 110/15 125/13 142/16 143/16 147/11 149/3 along [7] 13/3 33/15 37/15 91/12 91/19 92/2 130/6 already [20] 19/11 21/19 51/11 64/19 76/25 79/9 79/10 90/9 93/9 94/6 98/1 124/23 125/4 134/11 134/19 138/18 141/6 149/1 149/7 150/5 also [65] 9/25 10/13 12/5 12/12 15/22 20/8 20/15 28/5 32/20 37/6 41/12 41/16 43/6 43/23 44/2 44/23 46/15 46/23 47/21 49/12 50/10 50/13 51/4 53/13 53/17 53/21 55/1 55/8 55/23 56/7 56/20 58/6 59/13 63/4 64/24 65/3 66/11 68/15 73/20 74/15 75/9 76/15 79/4 80/20 80/23 87/15 88/4 91/23 105/8

107/10 110/4 113/7 115/13 121/18 131/4 133/11 135/22 140/10 142/15 143/22 147/7 148/12 148/13 150/18 150/24 alternative [2] 50/3 73/3 **alternatives** [1] 138/10 altogether [1] 142/22 always [5] 44/18 101/15 101/16 128/11 142/11 am [6] 15/22 32/1 32/6 32/23 101/8 152/5 **Amazon [45]** 58/19 58/23 58/23 58/24 59/1 59/3 59/7 71/19 85/15 87/6 88/18 89/17 89/20 90/2 90/8 90/25 91/9 92/11 95/17 99/5 102/12 102/14 104/6 104/23 104/24 105/1 105/3 105/4 105/16 106/3 109/14 110/24 121/21 126/17 126/21 128/2 131/12 132/16 132/17 132/25 133/13 133/23 134/2 142/11 145/3 **Amazon Fresh [1]** 89/20 **Amazon's [1]** 133/4 **Amazon.com** [1] 102/14 **Amazons [1]** 120/20 amend [2] 31/2 82/2 amended [3] 26/3 27/17 28/6 **America [1]** 95/13 American [5] 34/11 34/22 63/10 app [2] 47/23 47/24 104/11 143/7 Americans [6] 33/16 33/20 34/1 34/2 35/10 64/6 amicus [1] 80/16 among [2] 87/17 88/18 amount [4] 17/10 34/7 64/9 64/12 ample [1] 72/9 analysis [10] 18/3 18/7 50/17 55/16 57/10 59/10 67/23 79/18 118/20 127/23 analyze [2] 56/23 63/18 analyzed [1] 57/21 **Anderson [7]** 2/8 8/11 11/5 11/10 14/7 17/3 32/21 **Andrew [1]** 4/13 **Andy [3]** 42/1 46/22 111/3 **Andy Groff [3]** 42/1 46/22 111/3 Angeli [4] 5/2 5/2 10/5 10/6 **animation [1]** 46/5 announced [6] 38/8 61/23 105/19 132/13 132/16 135/1

announcement [1] 132/17 announcing [1] 128/14 annual [3] 37/12 83/21 96/11 **annually [2]** 112/7 113/18 another [16] 17/17 31/14 47/15 48/12 48/14 55/19 76/23 88/11 106/5 112/2 121/4 121/13 121/20 135/2 144/12 150/22 answer [3] 86/19 109/9 118/15 anticompetitive [15] 49/13 57/15 63/5 63/10 100/14 102/2 110/16 110/19 110/21 114/14 114/15 114/16 118/11 118/18 118/25 antitrust [9] 37/20 38/7 69/19 79/20 79/20 81/5 119/17 130/1 any [34] 7/16 7/18 13/6 14/24 15/9 15/10 17/7 19/23 32/9 38/7 51/7 59/4 66/11 69/15 72/10 74/24 79/17 80/5 82/8 86/19 86/19 97/9 104/9 104/20 104/21 118/24 119/20 122/22 130/14 133/25 140/20 144/4 144/5 145/4 anyone [1] 33/9 anything [2] 13/17 25/14 anywhere [1] 75/20 **APA [1]** 30/12 apparently [1] 105/10 **appearances** [2] 1/19 7/22 application [2] 56/21 58/1 applied [1] 95/25 applies [1] 95/25 apply [2] 118/3 149/23 applying [2] 57/2 69/13 appreciate [2] 17/2 17/2 approach [7] 19/16 24/19 32/17 78/14 82/24 116/10 123/15 approached [1] 149/19 approaches [1] 116/15 appropriate [4] 23/22 101/9 108/1 116/22 appropriately [1] 13/8 **approval** [1] 76/16 are [198] area [4] 19/19 38/24 39/1 39/19 areas [7] 18/22 43/1 43/14 61/12 73/14 73/16 122/16 aren't [1] 14/21 argue [4] 22/5 37/17 61/25

argue... [1] 67/20 argument [2] 51/8 51/12 arguments [4] 50/23 62/13 84/21 85/7 **ARIZONA [4]** 2/12 2/13 9/7 35/2 **Arnold [3]** 4/11 9/9 9/9 arose [1] 26/2 around [17] 11/3 11/23 14/10 30/19 47/6 48/14 48/17 70/15 70/22 83/11 86/13 109/20 121/11 124/15 139/10 139/22 145/13 **arranging** [1] 13/7 arrest [1] 81/11 arrive [1] 138/12 arrived [1] 138/15 **arriving [1]** 19/13 article [4] 106/9 119/13 131/25 132/2 articulated [1] 28/17 as [189] as it's [1] 65/21 ascent [1] 134/9 ascribed [1] 97/12 ask [13] 23/20 28/3 28/11 29/20 29/21 31/20 32/20 35/19 100/10 103/5 109/5 139/16 139/17 asked [5] 29/13 35/22 96/17 99/16 112/11 asking [8] 25/13 35/14 82/1 100/19 104/14 104/15 106/23 107/4 asks [1] 50/1 asserted [4] 101/10 102/11 106/4 106/5 assess [4] 20/23 56/12 57/10 57/23 assessed [2] 62/24 73/8 assesses [1] 51/21 assessing [3] 40/22 48/16 58/20 assessment [1] 67/22 asset [1] 30/8 assets [7] 66/5 66/13 73/1 75/11 75/24 147/6 147/9 assistance [2] 27/6 78/7 **associate** [1] 97/18 **associated** [1] 149/9 associates [15] 84/7 87/25 88/1 89/10 90/22 94/23 96/7 97/14

97/18 97/20 123/3 142/4 144/3

144/5 145/18 **associations** [1] 147/16 assortment [6] 21/5 50/16 53/7 55/1 58/9 73/21 assume [4] 63/24 84/24 127/4 127/4 assumes [1] 112/23 assuming [2] 23/10 32/4 assumption [2] 63/25 70/5 assumptions [2] 65/6 66/18 attack [1] 23/16 attempt [2] 72/1 77/22 attempted [1] 83/20 attempts [1] 60/18 attend [1] 7/20 attention [3] 7/11 115/5 129/22 **Attorney [7]** 2/13 2/17 2/21 3/2 3/6 3/10 3/13 **attorneys [3]** 11/24 61/17 80/15 attract [1] 64/25 **attracting [1]** 73/15 **attributable [1]** 133/23 August [3] 1/6 7/2 152/6 **authors [1]** 106/12 **automatic** [1] 43/18 automatically [1] 124/19 availability [1] 98/24 available [4] 19/6 98/24 137/2 137/4 Avenue [7] 2/9 2/18 4/2 4/7 4/11 5/9 5/20 average [1] 132/3 avocado [1] 55/13 avoid [3] 46/16 50/4 91/21 await [3] 122/25 123/1 123/3 aware [1] 12/23 away [3] 62/7 83/8 107/13 awful [1] 90/7 **AZ [1]** 2/14 В

back [11] 22/7 26/10 29/17 36/11 41/17 53/2 102/23 112/17 127/2 130/25 136/20 back-end [1] 41/17 backbone [1] 74/13 backup [1] 141/13 bafflement [1] 102/10 bag [3] 53/15 53/15 117/11 bags [1] 117/11 baker [3] 52/15 100/16 100/19 bakeries [1] 52/17

bakery [1] 55/3 balance [2] 65/25 99/11 **Balkin [1]** 27/11 **Baltimore** [1] 3/7 Bambo [3] 4/4 9/19 13/21 band [2] 112/1 112/3 Bank [1] 49/17 bankruptcy [2] 67/5 80/25 banner [11] 20/18 20/20 20/24 42/13 43/5 47/13 47/15 48/4 73/18 74/6 75/1 banners [34] 19/23 19/25 19/25 20/10 20/14 21/8 23/6 23/11 23/12 23/21 23/21 23/24 24/11 24/12 24/14 24/19 25/11 25/13 36/16 36/19 36/22 41/21 42/25 43/13 46/1 46/2 47/3 48/4 73/25 86/10 139/22 147/12 147/13 147/17 bargaining [11] 34/19 59/18 59/21 59/24 60/3 61/11 84/14 95/7 120/2 121/22 121/24 **Baron [1]** 54/23 Barrett [3] 2/8 8/11 11/10 Barrett Anderson [1] 11/10 **Barrington** [2] 4/6 9/22 base [8] 42/5 42/7 42/11 75/5 75/8 76/24 95/2 96/21 based [16] 12/15 15/23 23/13 43/13 65/6 69/4 73/13 111/12 111/12 111/12 112/5 116/18 118/18 118/19 121/5 129/19 baseline [1] 70/4 basic [2] 137/20 146/5 basically [3] 27/6 62/1 135/25 basing [1] 75/3 basis [2] 63/25 120/15 be [212] bear [6] 62/17 62/22 63/12 63/15 66/20 81/23 bears [1] 139/20 beat [2] 41/17 48/18 beating [2] 47/17 48/8 became [2] 52/16 90/18 because [66] 7/11 11/24 15/16 15/22 16/7 16/16 20/23 21/8 22/17 23/15 24/13 29/13 29/16 32/5 32/6 38/14 45/16 49/20 50/24 51/8 60/13 60/22 63/1 63/12 68/7 71/7 75/10 81/21 90/13 95/23 99/25 101/4 102/11 102/19 107/9 107/12 107/25

because... [29] 108/7 108/19 110/25 115/12 120/7 121/9 121/25 124/10 127/3 130/13 131/20 132/19 133/14 134/6 135/6 135/19 137/10 138/18 140/12 141/13 142/15 143/11 144/13 144/16 144/18 145/5 145/24 147/15 148/21 become [3] 77/25 139/14 148/15

becomes [2] 37/25 98/24 becoming [1] 134/22 been [26] 11/1 11/7 14/22 16/6 44/7 44/10 57/9 67/12 76/19 88/13 91/13 97/6 128/17 129/7 132/8 134/8 136/10 137/3 138/14 138/20 139/11 139/22 140/13 145/7 148/1 148/19 **before [15]** 1/17 13/25 13/25 17/16 27/7 32/16 66/20 72/5 82/7 122/11 122/23 129/11

138/10 138/15 148/11 begin [3] 7/23 35/22 149/8 behalf [10] 8/2 8/5 8/10 8/12 8/18 8/21 8/23 11/5 33/12 33/15

behavior [1] 73/8 behemoths [1] 99/4

being [16] 21/1 34/17 50/4 60/2 72/14 74/9 81/17 94/12 99/16 111/6 132/19 133/17 136/11 139/19 146/10 148/8

beings [1] 119/12

belated [1] 28/7

believe [15] 12/16 13/10 16/1 17/9 19/12 20/25 23/18 24/16 26/5 27/9 29/11 95/23 111/18 137/14 141/19

believes [1] 31/17 **Bells [1]** 120/21 below [1] 152/8

bench [1] 32/17

benefit [19] 34/11 34/17 41/19 41/20 75/16 82/15 91/11 91/11 96/6 96/7 96/7 96/8 97/11 97/13 98/15 99/2 123/8 141/6 145/20 benefits [20] 34/19 41/22 61/1 69/20 84/7 84/11 92/22 92/23 96/9 97/5 97/15 98/10 112/8 113/23 123/3 123/5 143/19 143/23 144/7 150/25

Beretta [1] 47/5

best [9] 63/24 88/16 91/17 91/18 91/18 104/24 138/15 141/25 142/6

bet [1] 119/25

Beth [2] 5/6 10/1

betrays [1] 83/23

better [20] 16/19 17/5 21/2 23/16 34/12 34/19 41/8 41/9 41/20 48/25 49/2 59/18 60/15 60/25 61/1 92/11 108/8 126/13 126/20 141/5

between [15] 34/25 40/10 43/19 47/3 49/7 51/23 53/14 64/19 65/2 75/1 84/25 111/14 114/8 122/18 126/3

beverages [1] 7/16 beyond [2] 83/16 127/5 big [9] 50/8 124/10 124/18 126/14 134/22 137/3 137/8 141/2 145/11

bigger [5] 95/14 134/24 134/24 140/9 146/21

biggest [3] 134/20 136/11 149/14

billion [33] 34/21 36/4 37/11 57/19 64/3 64/6 64/17 76/7 83/17 83/21 84/4 84/6 84/12 88/10 88/12 89/4 89/5 89/15 89/15 89/21 89/22 96/11 96/12 97/23 112/6 113/9 122/24 122/25 123/2 132/14 133/21 135/2 145/10

billion-dollar [2] 64/17 96/11 **billions [4]** 58/16 71/22 92/5 92/6

binary [1] 69/10 binder [1] 32/24

birthday [1] 55/5

bit [11] 29/20 37/24 43/21 105/8 110/23 110/24 121/22 124/5 127/8 129/12 135/23

bizarre [2] 116/13 121/18

bizarrely [1] 110/4

BJ's [1] 95/15

block [3] 35/4 35/8 119/1

blocks [1] 83/8 blue [1] 38/22

blurring [3] 131/16 131/21 135/8

board [2] 68/17 86/11 **boardroom** [1] 37/19 **boards [1]** 112/22

Bob [1] 68/18

Bob Palmer [1] 68/18 bodega [1] 92/25

Boise [1] 37/20

boots [2] 47/2 61/21

both [38] 12/19 18/24 36/21 40/14 40/14 41/1 41/4 41/8 41/20 42/9 42/9 43/2 43/2 43/2 44/13 46/23 51/9 52/8 53/7 55/25 56/9 57/3 57/25 58/8 59/23 71/22 84/11 91/19 94/8

95/16 96/22 102/13 102/24 118/13 118/13 119/4 144/14 146/22

bottom [3] 19/1 45/11 63/21 bought [3] 113/17 132/3 149/15

boundary [1] 107/2

box [2] 30/19 54/22

bracketing [1] 27/16 **Bradley [1]** 5/5

brainstorming [1] 49/3 **brakes [1]** 99/17

brand [5] 21/2 21/3 53/8 73/20 73/22

brands [18] 19/5 19/20 36/16 41/14 41/14 53/9 53/10 55/6 68/8 75/1 86/13 87/6 93/1 93/4 96/22 98/1 98/3 147/20

bread [2] 33/18 107/7

breadth [4] 52/21 52/21 53/1 53/6

break [4] 22/8 33/18 82/16 82/18

Brian [1] 3/1

brick [3] 58/24 59/6 89/18 brief [7] 80/16 89/1 102/22 103/12 129/23 129/23 129/25

briefing [4] 11/13 95/21 119/8 119/10

briefly [8] 62/13 72/3 90/12 90/17 119/2 143/18 147/8 150/6 bring [16] 15/9 22/2 22/17 83/17 84/20 84/21 92/6 92/8 92/8 92/9 94/4 103/5 112/7 115/9 143/23 150/25

bringing [8] 84/2 85/6 87/22 87/23 114/17 134/16 143/14 149/21

brings [2] 90/14 95/18 broad [1] 110/8

broader [6] 12/21 50/14 92/11 96/21 108/8 143/1

broadest [1] 134/3 Broderick [6] 48/2 48/7 48/21 48/24 65/14 65/23 Bros [2] 27/10 31/22

Brothers [2] 50/9 53/24 brought [6] 88/21 90/15 113/14 113/14 113/22 138/24

Brown [5] 51/20 55/17 62/4 127/16 127/16

buckets [3] 40/23 50/8 51/18

budget [1] 86/23 budgets [1] 33/25

build [2] 75/23 104/24

building [1] 76/7

bulk [2] 55/11 126/12

bullet [1] 74/25

bumping [1] 46/16

bunch [1] 147/20

burden [28] 35/23 36/1 36/7 49/10 59/3 61/8 61/14 61/15 61/16 62/11 62/17 62/22 62/23 62/24 63/12 63/15 65/24 71/9 71/13 81/23 82/3 101/14 101/15 101/16 101/17 101/25 102/4 129/13

burden-shifting [1] 62/23 business [22] 24/16 24/22 27/7 29/17 48/14 58/24 67/14 67/20 72/20 73/1 73/2 73/12 74/22 75/17 79/15 81/16 98/13 111/19 115/2 126/16 128/20 149/20

butcher [1] 52/15

buy [12] 50/25 51/3 51/8 51/14 73/3 125/15 125/22 130/24 131/22 137/20 137/22 137/24

buver [3] 71/13 76/15 76/16 buying [7] 73/5 93/24 126/10 132/16 138/1 142/13 146/22

buys [3] 126/10 126/12 139/1

Byron [2] 3/5 9/4

Byron Warren [1] 9/4

CA [2] 2/18 4/5 cake [1] 55/4 calculated [1] 70/9 calculation [1] 70/4 **CALIFORNIA [6]** 2/16 2/17 9/2 35/3 46/25 91/3 **call [9]** 17/25 33/9 42/3 54/19 60/7 72/22 87/7 132/24 132/25

51/11 53/8 56/18 57/22 100/16 103/15 120/22 131/14 132/18 133/18 135/18 149/8 calling [3] 67/13 68/3 149/16 calls [2] 43/9 137/18 came [2] 18/3 133/6 can [83]

can't [16] 19/14 38/13 38/17 55/13 64/16 71/23 91/1 101/9 101/12 102/25 108/17 110/17 115/4 126/1 139/23 140/14

candidate [1] 143/5

cannot [13] 7/18 27/22 69/9 74/20 82/3 107/25 108/1 118/23 125/9 126/18 139/14 143/16 144/8

capability [1] 68/6 **capacity [1]** 28/9 **Capitol** [1] 3/24 capped [1] 45/6

capstone [1] 88/8 **captive [1]** 75/18

captured [2] 112/19 134/2

carbon [1] 88/12

card [2] 117/14 117/15

care [1] 80/8 **career [1]** 148/17

careful [1] 68/11

Carr [1] 147/12

Carrs [1] 74/1

carry [2] 82/3 134/12

case [48] 1/4 7/8 13/5 13/16 14/22 16/23 17/8 17/12 18/1 18/4 18/5 18/10 27/10 40/1 40/7 47/16 49/11 51/5 52/1 57/10 57/13 57/22 59/13 59/14 62/10 62/11 63/24 68/16 70/2 71/9 80/2 84/17 90/5 92/4 96/25 101/5 103/17 103/18 105/24 106/8 109/23 110/7 112/25 113/1 116/7 119/10 124/22 129/13

cases [6] 47/17 49/5 53/2 63/15 69/13 127/14

Casey [2] 4/1 9/11 cash [1] 33/19 catch [1] 114/25 catching [1] 115/3 categories [1] 133/5 category [4] 52/24 56/17 62/4 146/18

called [16] 41/13 44/2 44/2 45/8 cause [4] 65/25 79/22 119/23 152/11

> caused [3] 66/6 77/23 115/16 causes [2] 56/10 77/17 causing [1] 144/19

CBA [1] 61/12 **CBAs [1]** 97/19 CCing [1] 48/21

CE [1] 47/7

ceiling [12] 44/23 44/24 45/6 45/7 45/8 45/11 45/15 45/22 46/8 46/10 46/14 46/17

Celsius [1] 115/20 **census** [1] 117/5

center [4] 12/12 70/16 70/23

107/5

centers [8] 37/9 37/10 73/10 75/17 76/8 95/5 144/4 148/8 **CEO [7]** 10/13 28/8 86/17 93/14

111/3 141/18 148/15 **cereal [1]** 146/17

certain [14] 19/20 21/9 26/19 30/13 42/6 44/14 53/10 57/12 64/15 65/3 65/3 65/25 142/21

147/13

certainly [6] 97/8 106/20 125/7 130/24 134/7 150/14

certainty [3] 65/5 81/8 124/16

certified [1] 152/13 certify [1] 152/8

cetera [3] 88/25 99/5 102/15 **chain [9]** 60/20 67/8 91/21 98/5 98/12 98/23 140/22 146/25

149/19

chains [2] 68/2 92/25

chair [1] 86/17 **chairs [1]** 22/18

challenged [1] 67/13

challenges [2] 73/9 141/20

championing [1] 128/11

chance [2] 100/11 142/17 **change [11]** 28/6 31/18 57/14 57/14 58/10 112/13 122/22

139/7 142/18 150/3 150/22 changed [3] 127/11 128/25

137/7

changes [6] 32/1 49/13 57/11 57/21 143/2 143/14

changing [4] 19/1 73/20 98/16 138/20

channel [2] 131/16 135/8 characteristics [3] 51/21 54/6 characteristics... [1] 55/16 characterization [1] 13/22 characterize [1] 149/10 charge [1] 46/24 **charges [1]** 139/2 **Charles [2]** 2/4 8/8 Charles Dickinson [1] 8/8 **Charms [1]** 54/23 chart [4] 113/11 117/21 118/2 118/9 **charts [5]** 45/23 45/24 45/25 90/7 138/4 cheaper [3] 91/22 137/25 147/3 check [8] 35/12 56/14 56/18 105/7 108/11 108/20 135/19 151/4 checked [1] 105/11 **checking [1]** 114/5 checkout [1] 148/10 checks [1] 56/16 Cheerios [2] 126/10 126/12 Cheese [5] 125/18 125/19 125/23 126/5 139/23 **cherry [1]** 136/19 **cherry-picked [1]** 136/19 **Cheyenne** [1] 3/24 Chicago [1] 3/3 chief [10] 9/14 18/1 18/4 18/10 68/16 71/9 87/16 94/17 135/18 148/14 chips [1] 53/15 **choice [5]** 21/5 69/11 105/1 117/7 135/12 choices [8] 39/2 39/20 41/20 49/20 57/7 85/17 96/21 112/21 **choose [3]** 53/3 53/14 116/12 **Chopper [2]** 67/9 76/18 **chose** [1] 33/9 chosen [2] 86/1 118/22 **Chris [1]** 8/12 **Christian [2]** 4/10 9/10 **Christine [2]** 4/16 9/11 Christopher [1] 3/16 Cincinnati [4] 4/18 37/20 86/5 circle [8] 107/5 107/12 107/18 107/20 109/20 109/21 110/8 110/10 circles [1] 138/4 Circuit [3] 27/10 27/12 69/5 circumstances [1] 101/7

cite [1] 127/15 city [1] 32/7 Civil [2] 3/20 27/13 claim [7] 66/10 71/18 79/14 80/12 85/20 119/5 146/3 claimed [1] 81/6 claiming [2] 129/15 129/17 claims [6] 63/14 66/19 71/16 71/17 71/23 80/3 clarified [1] 31/4 class [1] 104/25 Clayton [4] 81/10 81/11 119/11 119/13 Clayton Act [3] 81/10 119/11 119/13 clean [1] 145/15 **cleaning [1]** 117/13 clear [10] 30/15 50/18 60/25 69/25 74/20 75/3 132/22 134/14 139/14 140/2 **clearer [1]** 38/1 clearly [2] 7/11 91/10 click [1] 46/5 client [3] 9/11 10/8 23/5 clock [1] 11/23 **clone [1]** 148/3 close [10] 28/24 29/4 66/9 67/2 68/19 74/23 76/24 79/21 80/10 144/4 closed [2] 72/6 80/25 closely [1] 42/21 closer [8] 37/21 102/20 112/8 113/15 114/18 114/18 115/8 115/10 closes [1] 83/6 closing [4] 35/20 79/11 111/9 142/21 closures [2] 84/10 123/3 **clothing [1]** 131/6 **club [7]** 50/15 55/7 55/7 58/9 104/1 106/2 106/12 **CMCR [4]** 115/18 115/19 116/5 117/24 **CMCRs [2]** 57/22 57/23 **co [3]** 8/3 35/2 39/13 co-counsel [1] 8/3 co-plaintiff [1] 35/2 co-plaintiffs' [1] 39/13 coaching [1] 97/17 coast [7] 37/16 90/1 90/1 90/1 90/1 90/2 90/2 cognizable [2] 62/17 65/24

Coke [2] 53/8 91/18 colleague [12] 11/10 14/5 16/11 18/14 32/17 32/21 33/15 48/9 62/15 66/1 90/13 119/3 colleagues [1] 127/16 collected [1] 42/24 collective [3] 39/3 84/14 95/7 collectively [4] 37/8 38/25 39/17 115/10 **collects** [1] 29/6 Colorado [3] 35/6 46/25 79/12 **COLUMBIA [6]** 2/20 2/21 8/25 35/3 37/3 37/7 column [1] 118/9 **columns** [1] 118/3 combat [1] 84/13 combine [3] 92/2 118/15 124/18 combined [13] 30/9 39/18 39/18 70/24 70/25 77/13 86/1 126/19 127/1 127/5 127/9 143/15 146/21 combining [2] 140/8 141/3 come [14] 16/15 16/16 22/7 26/10 44/12 83/9 91/15 99/23 113/6 121/6 121/7 138/3 144/12 149/5 comes [13] 18/4 22/6 84/9 86/16 87/1 87/3 87/3 87/6 87/8 108/8 116/14 121/1 139/7 comfortable [1] 22/18 coming [5] 33/17 34/18 71/13 133/7 150/22 **commences** [1] 79/12 **commented** [1] 68/18 commerce [7] 37/12 40/3 40/4 40/11 77/15 77/20 119/13 commercial [5] 127/17 127/19 127/25 127/25 138/4 commission [12] 1/3 2/3 2/4 2/8 7/7 8/2 8/6 8/8 8/10 23/13 105/9 152/3 commissioned [2] 19/4 24/9 **commitment [4]** 93/9 93/17 93/20 97/23 commitments [3] 84/9 89/9 144/8 committed [3] 68/21 84/2 95/6 **commodity [1]** 119/12 common [8] 33/17 47/10 47/10 54/5 54/11 101/7 112/15 117/9 commonly [2] 51/11 54/25 **communities** [18] 34/2 37/13

communities... [16] 38/2 38/19 39/8 40/13 49/14 69/20 81/4 81/19 85/17 88/4 96/8 96/10 123/4 143/8 145/13 151/1 communities' [1] 80/11 community [11] 39/3 39/6 39/11 39/11 86/8 88/8 88/25 90/2 116/25 142/24 143/1 companies [28] 1/7 5/1 7/8 16/2 34/25 36/24 37/8 37/18 43/2 58/22 64/20 65/2 67/17 79/24 88/20 103/14 103/15 113/16 119/4 120/12 121/8 128/5 128/20 130/3 140/9 142/11 143/15 150/17 companies' [1] 36/12 company [33] 1/6 4/1 4/17 7/7 31/22 38/5 44/12 59/17 60/13 64/22 65/18 73/4 73/4 76/24 85/22 89/8 93/3 121/4 121/5 121/14 126/19 127/9 139/19 139/20 140/10 141/20 141/23 141/25 142/3 142/24 148/24 148/25 150/23 compare [4] 109/3 122/11 122/15 122/17 compared [1] 75/11 comparing [2] 43/11 48/3 compensating [1] 57/23 compete [34] 34/6 37/13 41/4 41/12 41/13 41/14 41/16 42/9 42/18 46/14 46/16 48/14 48/19 48/25 61/18 71/19 75/4 75/9 91/9 91/12 94/9 99/4 104/8 108/4 126/18 126/20 128/21 138/13 138/20 139/14 140/15 141/5 142/4 142/9 **competence** [1] 93/20 competes [4] 104/8 114/2 114/3 135/4 competing [4] 120/17 120/18 120/19 142/17 competition [61] 23/16 34/12 34/18 34/25 35/12 36/12 37/21

38/12 38/16 40/9 40/16 40/19 40/21 40/22 40/23 41/4 41/19 41/24 43/19 44/5 45/21 46/11 46/20 47/2 47/5 47/11 47/13 47/19 47/20 47/25 48/8 48/21 49/2 49/7 49/18 49/19 49/24 52/4 55/24 56/3 56/11 59/20

61/11 64/19 64/24 65/2 65/4 65/16 66/6 66/11 69/8 71/5 78/22 79/23 81/13 81/22 106/13 112/9 114/21 119/20 141/15 competitive [26] 21/1 61/19 62/21 69/2 70/7 73/11 76/1 79/24 87/12 87/14 88/23 88/24 89/25 92/9 92/10 97/3 97/3 100/12 100/22 104/16 115/16 117/7 127/11 129/8 137/8 147/7 **competitively [8]** 19/8 21/6 21/12 23/8 23/17 80/4 110/11 141/21 competitiveness [2] 88/22 138/16 competitor [22] 42/13 42/15 42/19 42/20 42/22 43/1 43/18 45/8 45/10 45/13 48/17 60/10 60/11 60/12 60/14 71/20 71/25 85/6 89/6 94/12 95/16 136/17 **competitor's [1]** 43/13 competitors [16] 23/14 37/18 58/20 79/22 87/24 103/13 103/20 108/19 109/4 128/3 133/12 136/8 137/3 137/9 138/5 138/14 **competitors' [1]** 43/12 complaint [4] 102/11 102/16 106/4 106/6 140/10 143/15 complementing [1] 94/5 complements [1] 37/18 complete [6] 28/20 29/10 31/6 35/21 75/6 81/18 completely [2] 27/7 128/25 complex [2] 106/7 117/7 **compliance** [1] 27/12 **complicated** [1] 43/21 components [2] 42/4 58/23 composed [3] 50/7 50/11 86/9 **comprised** [1] 50/19 compromise [2] 86/23 86/24 **concede [1]** 82/3 **concedes [1]** 70/20 concentration [6] 40/13 49/14 57/11 57/15 57/17 57/21 concept [4] 18/24 102/19 122/14 150/2 concern [8] 16/17 27/25 28/5

38/12 39/24 61/22 118/17

118/18

concerned [3] 13/1 39/5 39/22 **concerning [1]** 117/24 concerns [4] 29/15 38/7 40/1 61/19 conclude [2] 71/14 122/24 concluded [1] 151/8 concludes [2] 28/25 73/13 conclusion [3] 40/15 65/20 80/6 conclusions [1] 59/5 **conditions** [1] 60/15 conduct [1] 69/4 conduct-based [1] 69/4 confer [3] 11/2 12/9 15/9 **conference** [1] 12/25 **conferred [3]** 18/18 26/13 28/3 **conferring** [1] 149/1 confers [1] 13/4 confess [1] 102/9 **confident** [1] 62/8 confidential [11] 12/20 19/22 20/2 21/7 23/8 23/13 24/5 24/17 24/21 33/4 79/25 confidentiality [11] 12/11 12/14 13/24 14/19 15/10 16/18 16/21 45/17 74/8 80/3 125/25 conformed [1] 152/12 confront [2] 27/23 28/12 confusing [1] 29/9 Congress [2] 2/13 65/15 complementary [4] 91/10 92/14 connection [7] 66/21 67/1 67/8 72/4 72/8 72/18 76/17 Connolly [3] 5/9 9/25 10/1 conservative [3] 66/18 67/10 77/9 consider [4] 68/24 118/13 124/2 141/11 **Consideration [2]** 80/9 80/23 considering [6] 69/4 80/10 80/24 81/13 118/10 126/23 considers [1] 124/7 consistent [8] 12/24 26/25 27/21 29/7 29/23 31/17 106/19 106/20 consolidation [2] 36/23 49/22 **constrains** [1] 112/9 constraints [1] 61/4 consumer [7] 3/14 19/5 19/7 19/20 19/24 125/3 132/3 consumers [22] 21/4 49/21 49/21 90/22 96/6 103/3 112/8 130/2 130/11 130/15 130/16 130/17 130/18 131/21 131/21

consumers... [7] 133/16 135/13 135/21 141/15 142/14 143/7 145/18 consumers' [1] 106/14 contact [1] 31/11 contemplates [1] 12/2 contend [1] 77/22 contends [1] 100/13 context [4] 36/12 64/5 64/7 138/22 contingencies [1] 65/7 **contingent** [1] 64/14 continue [10] 12/8 12/17 13/9 13/25 43/16 70/6 82/22 85/8 146/9 150/10 **continued** [1] 13/3 **continues** [1] 48/8 continuing [1] 7/24 contract [5] 27/9 28/16 29/22 30/4 31/18 **contracts** [1] 72/8 **contradict** [1] 71/16 contrast [2] 54/2 67/22 control [2] 37/11 39/1 controlling [1] 27/9 convenience [5] 51/4 51/9 51/15 54/10 105/2 **convenient [1]** 41/16 **conversation** [1] 144/12 conversations [2] 12/13 13/23 convinces [1] 118/21 **COO [2]** 10/14 47/7 cooled [1] 105/14 **cooperate** [1] 78/4 cooperatively [1] 14/3 **coordinate** [1] 78/6 **copies [3]** 32/17 82/25 123/16 copy [2] 7/14 32/25 corner [3] 93/1 106/19 140/21 corporate [6] 26/18 28/10 66/23 74/16 86/6 111/10 correct [2] 118/16 152/9 correctly [2] 110/14 110/15 correspond [1] 73/21 Corvallis [6] 38/20 39/2 39/5 39/9 56/6 70/21 **Cosset [2]** 9/14 94/6 cost [9] 57/23 71/22 85/5 85/6 87/18 116/3 125/22 126/13 142/18 Costco [50] 55/8 55/13 58/13

58/19 59/9 59/9 85/15 87/8 88/18 89/12 90/1 90/8 90/25 91/9 92/10 95/17 99/5 102/15 104/1 104/5 104/11 104/18 104/20 106/1 106/17 107/11 109/1 109/6 109/14 109/20 110/1 110/24 126/9 126/9 126/12 126/15 126/20 128/1 128/10 131/9 133/11 133/23 136/11 136/13 136/23 137/4 137/11 137/20 142/11 145/3 Costcos [1] 127/22 costs [17] 75/23 76/9 79/14 117/10 117/12 117/13 117/14 117/15 117/16 117/17 139/1 139/5 139/10 139/11 139/11 142/12 143/11 could [19] 16/14 23/21 24/15 30/18 48/25 58/14 66/23 71/14 79/6 95/15 99/23 114/21 115/4 120/6 122/11 122/19 142/19 142/20 142/20 couldn't [1] 63/4 Council [2] 105/11 105/21 counsel [20] 4/16 7/22 8/3 9/12 10/9 12/24 18/18 19/12 22/12 22/13 26/22 26/23 83/20 84/24 95/9 97/6 100/17 108/6 114/4 151/4 counsel's [3] 62/7 93/15 100/25 crises [1] 113/13 counseled [1] 63/14 **count [6]** 104/16 104/20 105/16 105/17 105/19 109/8 counters [1] 53/18 country [24] 33/16 34/2 34/15 34/17 36/17 36/25 39/11 40/14 41/10 49/8 49/15 52/16 59/16 61/13 81/4 83/12 84/1 86/13 97/4 97/11 124/15 130/10 131/7 140/24 couple [4] 11/12 45/23 120/10 143/18 coupons [1] 42/6 course [39] 13/5 16/18 27/19 30/16 38/15 39/9 40/24 45/1 51/19 52/7 53/20 54/12 55/14 55/22 55/23 56/13 56/25 58/17

58/25 59/22 59/25 60/17 60/20

67/22 67/24 105/9 107/10

142/3 143/3 146/1 147/9

107/19 109/23 109/24 112/6

124/17 126/17 133/11 139/18

11/3 11/6 12/23 13/11 14/6 17/11 22/15 26/7 26/13 30/7 30/20 31/5 35/14 35/19 36/13 36/15 39/25 40/19 41/22 42/23 43/6 46/22 47/21 48/13 49/16 51/13 51/14 52/6 53/20 53/23 55/25 63/2 63/14 66/12 68/22 69/10 69/20 71/14 74/9 76/15 78/17 79/12 80/13 82/1 82/15 96/1 124/2 126/2 126/22 127/18 150/18 152/16 Court's [2] 17/21 30/4 courthouse [2] 5/19 90/15 courtroom [12] 7/13 7/15 13/8 14/2 15/24 22/9 30/19 32/2 77/7 84/19 86/18 94/6 courts [6] 35/7 40/20 40/23 50/18 51/11 68/24 cover [2] 27/17 124/4 Cowie [2] 5/7 10/3 **CRC [2]** 5/19 152/15 create [1] 24/2 created [1] 43/9 creating [4] 34/9 62/1 76/8 94/12 creation [1] 89/19 credible [1] 60/1 **credit [3]** 33/19 117/14 117/15 critical [4] 88/6 95/6 111/19 132/11 **Cromwell [1]** 23/3 cross [13] 14/11 14/13 14/21 14/25 15/12 15/18 16/12 16/13 16/15 16/23 17/8 17/13 51/11 cross-examination [10] 14/11 14/13 14/21 15/12 15/18 16/12 16/13 16/15 17/8 17/13 cross-examinations [1] 16/23 cross-shopping [1] 51/11 crowded [1] 22/7 **CRR [2]** 5/19 152/15 **Crush [1]** 48/10 **crushing [1]** 138/23 **CSR [4]** 5/19 152/15 152/17 152/17 curbside [1] 87/10 **curious [1]** 30/20 current [18] 21/3 27/21 40/9 67/14 68/17 70/7 76/13 85/8 86/21 94/16 98/7 98/10 111/15

court [57] 1/1 1/18 3/20 5/19 7/3

current... [5] 112/18 113/6 113/9 121/6 122/4 currently [18] 20/12 20/21 21/7 34/2 34/16 38/23 59/16 64/22 73/18 73/25 74/1 75/10 75/20 78/3 98/12 98/22 100/1 148/14 customer [15] 26/19 28/22 28/24 29/3 29/3 41/18 51/14 52/11 73/8 75/3 84/5 135/17 136/1 136/12 137/24 customer-basing [1] 75/3 customer-facing [1] 41/18 customers [60] 39/20 48/1 50/3 51/2 56/2 62/20 64/25 68/14 73/15 75/18 81/8 83/18 84/1 84/3 85/8 86/22 87/4 89/10 91/12 91/20 91/23 91/24 92/3 92/8 93/9 96/9 96/17 96/19 97/22 98/4 98/7 98/25 103/18 103/24 106/16 107/15 107/19 113/6 113/10 113/23 115/25 122/25 123/1 126/13 129/19 130/7 133/6 136/4 136/8 137/10 137/19 139/3 141/25 142/4 142/25 143/12 145/12 147/16 147/18 151/1 **customers' [2]** 104/4 138/7 cut [1] 66/22 cuts [2] 80/12 105/20 cv [3] 1/4 7/8 152/4 CVS [2] 54/11 131/10

D.C [2] 37/14 105/12 dairy [1] 95/3 **Dallas [1]** 110/6 **Dan [1]** 3/12 data [23] 13/1 26/19 28/22 28/24 29/3 29/6 29/7 29/16 30/13 42/24 56/12 56/25 96/17 103/15 110/12 113/25 114/1 118/19 130/14 135/10 136/17 137/2 137/4 date [5] 77/17 88/10 119/11 152/16 152/17 **David [2]** 5/2 10/6 **David Angeli** [1] 10/6 **Davis [2]** 4/10 9/10 day [28] 1/15 7/9 13/25 26/22 27/7 27/13 29/5 29/18 38/9 39/23 79/10 83/6 86/7 94/25

96/10 102/4 107/24 115/8 115/8 124/16 127/20 132/7 132/17 148/2 148/11 148/11 149/2 152/5 days [3] 16/19 32/6 83/13 DC [6] 2/5 2/9 2/22 4/12 4/14 5/10 deadline [2] 27/13 75/6 deal [22] 30/7 31/13 34/21 34/23 35/8 35/11 35/20 36/10 60/23 60/25 61/2 67/11 67/23 76/12 81/16 86/3 94/3 94/4 94/7 125/10 125/17 145/11 deals [3] 30/12 78/19 127/19 debt [1] 72/15 dec [1] 86/25 decade [3] 132/9 132/11 145/6 decades [4] 81/1 94/18 94/19 149/23 **Dechert [1]** 10/3 decide [4] 99/15 122/7 130/9 150/16 decided [2] 112/25 113/1 deciding [3] 95/23 105/23 116/9 Denver [2] 48/2 69/17 decision [3] 84/20 150/24 150/25 **decisions** [1] 78/3 deck [1] 48/14 decline [2] 74/7 113/18 **declined** [1] 113/12 decorum [1] 7/15 decrease [3] 50/5 105/5 117/17 dedicated [1] 84/4 deeper [1] 86/2 **DEFENDANT [2]** 4/1 5/1 defendants [48] 1/8 12/16 12/21 12/25 13/16 28/3 35/20 36/7 37/11 37/17 50/23 56/13 59/2 59/15 61/15 61/16 61/18 62/6 62/9 62/17 62/18 62/22 63/12 63/15 65/6 65/23 66/8 66/15 67/16 67/20 69/1 69/5 69/9 69/19 71/13 71/17 72/14 76/15 77/21 78/5 79/4 79/6 80/12 81/7 81/23 82/2 101/18 102/1 defendants' [19] 12/14 13/11 18/10 27/25 30/15 47/7 59/23 61/17 61/20 61/22 62/15 63/21 64/3 70/5 70/19 71/9 71/16 75/20 110/20 defense's [2] 14/15 15/11

deferring [1] 13/13 definable [1] 51/16 define [6] 49/24 50/6 50/6 52/2 110/13 110/14 defined [7] 51/1 57/9 100/20 100/21 101/13 101/13 102/7 defining [2] 49/25 58/20 definition [3] 16/13 50/24 56/7 definitively [1] 110/20 delay [2] 26/8 80/12 deleted [1] 29/8 deli [2] 117/12 137/23 delis [1] 49/5 deliver [2] 142/4 143/12 delivered [1] 87/10 delivery [3] 26/5 41/16 87/10 demographics [1] 29/3 demonstrate [1] 78/25 demonstrative [2] 32/18 36/15 demonstratives [1] 12/8 denigrate [1] 85/20 denominator [1] 116/6 density [3] 140/19 140/22 141/4 depart [1] 16/3 department [3] 3/19 8/14 52/18 depend [2] 33/20 35/1 dependence [1] 78/8 **Dependency [1]** 71/21 dependent [2] 74/10 74/15 depending [2] 116/5 131/7 deposition [8] 18/21 26/6 26/23 26/24 27/4 54/20 111/9 112/11 depositions [1] 111/8 **Depot [2]** 121/8 121/16 depth [4] 52/21 52/23 53/4 53/6 derives [1] 116/14 describe [2] 23/19 98/9 described [2] 57/10 151/1 **describes** [1] 74/9 description [1] 20/19 design [1] 93/23 designated [1] 12/22 designations [2] 12/14 13/24 designed [2] 45/9 139/5 despite [1] 117/18 destination [2] 20/20 20/24 detail [4] 23/19 28/19 45/2 53/22 details [2] 25/3 25/4 determinants [1] 117/6 **determine [4]** 7/10 25/1 49/23

determine... [1] 150/17 **determining [1]** 25/10 detour [3] 30/18 129/12 140/11 develop [1] 43/17 development [1] 80/1 device [1] 7/23 devices [1] 7/18 **Dickinson [2]** 2/4 8/8 did [13] 17/17 17/21 19/25 24/2 27/3 30/3 66/20 101/23 108/12 108/20 125/1 131/17 138/12 didn't [5] 16/8 19/23 31/24 100/17 122/12 differ [1] 55/15 difference [5] 84/25 114/8 122/13 122/17 122/18 differences [2] 53/22 140/18 different [24] 19/4 19/5 21/5 24/6 28/9 47/9 50/25 51/2 51/2 54/4 54/6 54/17 55/1 55/8 86/10 116/16 116/16 130/19 132/3 132/6 134/15 138/6 142/20 150/2 differently [1] 55/18 difficult [4] 33/25 79/22 138/20 142/9 dig [1] 86/2 digital [1] 93/24 digitally [1] 152/12 diligence [1] 72/22 diminish [1] 83/20 dinner [1] 33/17 direct [9] 12/7 14/16 14/18 15/1 15/5 15/12 15/14 16/16 79/22 direction [1] 18/17 directly [3] 81/2 93/19 141/10 director [1] 111/5 directors [1] 112/22 disadvantage [1] 25/22 disagree [4] 17/3 107/10 116/11 150/9 disagreement [1] 95/22 **disclose [1]** 18/9 disclosed [1] 15/5 disclosure [3] 13/3 15/2 28/7 disclosures [1] 12/7 disconnect [2] 99/12 99/14 discounts [2] 42/6 80/1 discovered [2] 27/18 137/24 discovery [2] 14/23 74/23 discuss [10] 12/21 14/4 14/5

22/8 26/9 26/12 62/15 66/2 72/23 150/2 discussed [7] 12/5 70/14 72/2 78/5 138/15 144/25 147/10 discussing [5] 19/19 47/16 47/19 72/5 138/14 discussion [1] 18/20 discussions [1] 33/4 dispersed [2] 77/2 140/24 **displayed** [1] 13/7 **displaying [1]** 45/16 displays [1] 145/16 **dispositive** [1] 150/15 dispute [1] 115/15 **disputes [1]** 115/12 disregard [2] 105/23 107/11 disregards [1] 104/4 disruption [1] 142/24 distances [1] 109/15 distinction [2] 115/20 122/13 distinctions [1] 51/22 **distributed** [1] 84/13 distribution [15] 37/10 72/20 73/10 74/12 75/17 76/8 95/5 98/5 98/23 140/23 144/4 146/15 146/22 146/25 148/8 **DISTRICT [10]** 1/1 1/2 1/18 2/20 2/21 5/19 8/25 35/3 37/3 37/7 diversion [3] 115/24 116/14 117/4 diversions [1] 116/18 divest [1] 92/15 divested [10] 19/4 67/7 70/22 76/1 76/17 77/6 77/16 146/10 148/4 148/8 divestiture [75] 19/21 20/13 26/20 27/2 28/2 61/20 66/2 66/4 66/10 66/13 66/16 66/19 66/25 67/6 67/12 68/4 68/5 68/11 68/14 68/19 68/23 68/25 69/1 69/17 69/18 70/3 70/5 70/6 70/12 70/13 70/17 70/24 70/25 71/4 71/8 71/12 71/15 71/16 72/9 72/13 72/25 73/7 73/23 75/10 75/24 76/4 76/11 76/14 76/16 76/18 77/5 77/22 78/21 80/10 81/9 81/21 82/2 85/21 92/17 93/21 118/6 118/12 118/14 118/16 145/23 146/1 148/11 148/12 148/15 149/6 149/8 149/11 149/12 149/14 149/22

divestiture's [1] 67/18 divestitures [5] 62/16 66/20 118/6 118/11 145/24 division [5] 3/14 46/23 47/1 48/2 48/3 divisions [4] 47/6 47/10 111/11 149/4 Dixie [3] 93/11 98/9 134/25 **DNA [1]** 86/16 do [72] 14/2 15/11 15/17 17/5 17/25 18/5 19/23 22/14 24/5 24/13 28/15 30/18 31/13 31/15 34/8 38/20 48/17 48/22 48/25 55/5 62/19 68/19 72/9 75/20 77/21 78/11 79/4 87/11 87/12 87/12 90/10 94/1 94/9 99/16 99/17 100/12 108/12 113/3 113/4 113/5 113/5 115/7 118/13 120/23 121/11 122/8 125/5 125/13 125/14 126/7 126/8 127/11 127/21 128/23 129/1 131/3 131/4 132/6 136/1 139/4 139/16 139/25 140/15 140/16 140/17 140/17 141/8 142/6 142/10 143/16 143/16 150/4 document [16] 14/12 14/24 15/1 19/9 24/17 24/21 30/8 44/10 44/13 45/2 45/17 111/20 111/20 111/23 112/3 136/22 documents [21] 13/6 14/16 14/18 17/7 18/21 30/9 40/8 40/24 42/8 48/13 51/20 52/7 54/13 59/25 60/17 60/20 67/22 67/24 136/19 136/21 138/22 does [39] 7/16 7/19 18/8 23/10 31/2 45/11 51/6 51/15 63/10 69/19 73/17 75/4 75/10 76/11 86/24 87/14 89/20 93/22 94/1 106/25 112/11 115/22 116/2 117/20 118/9 120/16 122/19 126/7 127/13 134/7 140/24 141/7 141/8 142/23 143/3 144/10 145/2 145/9 146/4 doesn't [15] 16/16 19/23 29/14 60/13 78/11 99/24 100/2 104/9 104/20 105/7 109/16 114/9 122/12 142/2 143/9 doing [7] 23/11 47/12 79/15 82/13 82/17 85/11 150/5 **DOJ [1]** 57/12 dollar [26] 34/23 35/11 54/2 54/9 64/8 64/17 90/5 95/14

dollar... [18] 96/11 103/19 103/20 116/4 131/8 133/1 133/7 133/8 133/24 134/2 134/5 134/9 134/10 134/15 134/15 135/25 136/5 137/20 **Dollar Tree [1]** 54/9 dollars [15] 45/16 45/18 58/16 76/7 83/17 84/6 92/5 92/7 104/5 112/6 122/24 123/2 132/14 136/8 145/10 dominance [1] 85/15 dominate [2] 135/5 135/7 dominating [1] 91/13 don't [29] 13/10 17/3 21/6 21/10 21/17 21/20 22/14 23/17 23/22 25/21 25/21 26/7 29/19 30/5 55/4 58/10 103/7 104/15 104/16 104/20 106/10 107/6 109/7 109/12 111/16 115/14 121/15 130/12 143/2 done [12] 17/10 87/24 88/20 94/11 94/12 101/8 107/23 110/17 128/7 128/23 141/22 148/21 doors [1] 68/19 double [1] 122/4 doubled [2] 89/13 132/20 doubling [1] 89/14 doubt [1] 82/8 down [23] 65/17 65/19 66/8 83/9 83/17 84/20 87/23 105/12 113/6 113/8 113/8 113/14 113/18 113/22 118/5 124/14 125/12 129/2 132/21 132/21 135/14 138/24 139/10 downside [1] 68/7 downtown [1] 85/17 downward [1] 46/9 dozen [2] 85/9 95/2

dozens [5] 36/5 36/15 83/9 94/22 126/6

Dr [39] 18/1 18/2 18/5 18/6 30/21 30/22 51/6 56/8 56/20 57/20 57/25 59/8 63/25 70/4 70/9 70/19 73/7 77/6 97/2 102/17 103/5 108/3 108/5 108/7 112/11 112/17 115/14 116/13 116/18 117/2 117/4 117/5 117/17 117/23 118/1 118/2 118/8 118/15 134/4

Dr. [16] 17/21 18/3 18/10 21/23

29/25 56/12 56/25 57/2 57/16 58/6 58/8 59/5 73/13 74/5 117/2 118/19 **Dr. Fox [3]** 21/23 73/13 74/5 **Dr. Galante [1]** 29/25 **Dr. Hill [7]** 56/12 56/25 57/2 57/16 58/6 58/8 117/2 **Dr. Hill's [2]** 59/5 118/19 **Dr. Israel's [3]** 17/21 18/3 18/10 draft [1] 68/18 draw [2] 51/22 129/22 drawn [2] 65/20 109/19 drew [2] 110/5 110/7 drive [7] 41/15 48/19 106/17 107/15 107/15 107/19 110/1 due [6] 49/13 61/4 76/6 81/22 106/13 125/25 during [10] 17/8 18/1 18/5 18/10 26/7 26/23 29/6 29/12 35/20 87/20 duties [1] 93/20

Ε

DX2905 [1] 20/16

74/7 120/18

dynamic [2] 39/10 138/17

each [10] 34/18 42/9 47/16

58/19 58/21 60/13 61/18 72/3

earlier [4] 46/7 70/14 72/2 84/24

early [2] 26/11 52/14 earnings [5] 80/22 128/10 128/15 132/24 132/25 Earth [1] 132/12 easier [1] 77/1 easily [1] 65/20 **East [1]** 91/7 **Easter [1]** 47/6 **EBT [1]** 33/20 economic [9] 57/22 70/2 105/11 105/21 116/25 119/15 127/23 133/2 133/21 economically [1] 119/7 economics [4] 112/23 113/1 115/11 115/13 economist [1] 70/19 economists [2] 52/1 56/23 **EDE [1]** 56/18 edited [1] 21/18 **education** [1] 120/13 **Edward [1]** 73/7 **Edward Fox [1]** 73/7 effect [15] 27/22 69/7 70/4 77/9

78/19 83/25 102/2 104/19 110/19 110/21 114/5 114/12 116/3 118/18 118/25 effective [7] 20/5 71/20 71/24 79/19 81/5 81/24 82/10 effectively [5] 75/24 78/6 91/12 140/15 142/17 effects [1] 127/17 **effectuate** [1] 81/17 effectuated [1] 65/9 efficiencies [19] 36/9 58/3 62/12 62/14 62/18 62/18 62/23 63/3 63/4 63/6 63/18 63/22 64/15 64/16 65/24 66/22 79/14 92/6 113/4 efficiency [2] 17/2 17/9 efficient [3] 14/24 15/20 20/5 effort [1] 35/9 efforts [5] 24/25 41/18 60/19 138/13 139/9 eggs [1] 107/7 **EGK [1]** 116/19 eight [2] 39/19 124/4 eighth [2] 93/2 95/12 either [13] 14/12 21/9 36/8 44/4 47/22 65/8 69/9 75/5 91/1 103/8 108/19 111/25 116/5 **electronic** [1] 7/18 electronics [1] 22/9 **elements [1]** 129/12 eleven [1] 76/11 eliminate [3] 34/24 65/4 78/21 **eliminates** [1] 40/20 **Ellickson [1]** 106/9 else [7] 87/19 94/3 115/25 136/5 137/12 138/2 143/5 email [5] 38/6 38/9 47/4 48/21 48/22 emailing [1] 48/24 emails [1] 59/12 employ [3] 34/14 37/12 80/7 **employed** [1] 66/10 employee [4] 48/24 121/1 143/23 144/7 employees [26] 34/15 34/16 59/24 61/22 66/9 67/3 74/19 78/13 80/24 81/4 89/10 103/3 117/11 121/6 121/11 138/19 141/15 142/1 142/25 143/8 143/13 144/18 145/13 147/25 148/7 151/1 **employees' [1]** 62/8

140/5

employer [3] 60/8 60/8 78/1 employer's [1] 60/10 **employers [3]** 59/15 144/14 144/23 **employs [3]** 37/2 37/4 37/5 **encapsulate** [1] 135/24 **encourage** [1] 151/4 end [9] 12/3 41/17 76/20 93/15 102/4 119/14 134/13 135/3 138/1 enforcement [3] 3/20 79/20 81/5 engage [1] 130/8 enhance [2] 84/4 84/11 enhanced [3] 96/16 98/23 99/1 enhancements [1] 98/4 enjoin [2] 126/24 144/17 enjoined [3] 49/19 79/11 141/14 enjoining [2] 69/15 82/9 **enormous [2]** 90/9 133/14 enough [8] 12/4 13/15 16/8 25/15 31/13 37/19 146/10 146/11 ensure [4] 45/9 45/14 63/9 148/1 ensures [1] 112/9 enter [2] 69/21 99/9 entered [1] 34/21 entering [2] 78/6 131/18 **Enterprise [1]** 61/24 **Enterprises [1]** 27/11 enthused [1] 94/20 enthusiasm [2] 93/19 143/10 enticing [2] 34/8 34/10 entire [3] 22/14 116/25 148/17 entirely [1] 92/14 entirety [2] 7/21 22/10 entities [1] 127/24 entitled [1] 152/10 entity [2] 39/4 39/18 **entrants** [1] 135/8 entry [1] 48/23 Enu [3] 5/5 9/25 123/22 **Enu Mainigi [1]** 9/25 equities [5] 79/4 79/17 80/9 80/23 81/6 equity [1] 88/7 **Era [1]** 131/25 Eric [3] 68/5 68/13 93/13 errata [12] 26/3 26/5 27/3 27/5 27/6 27/14 27/15 27/17 27/22

28/11 31/18 31/20 especially [2] 124/7 132/11 essence [2] 79/6 150/7 essentially [2] 67/20 103/17 establish [8] 52/16 68/8 81/23 101/9 107/25 108/1 121/25 122/20 established [3] 100/16 100/22 116/21 **establishing [2]** 51/20 52/8 **estate [1]** 75/13 Estefania [2] 2/20 8/25 et [6] 1/3 7/7 88/25 99/5 102/15 152/3 Eugene [1] 38/18 evaluates [1] 68/23 even [29] 16/15 16/20 19/25 39/10 58/12 72/1 72/10 75/25 77/22 78/14 98/7 98/9 98/15 107/13 110/1 111/4 118/21 122/19 125/1 125/13 127/5 128/7 130/25 132/25 134/2 134/3 137/10 139/22 139/23 event [4] 79/17 97/9 149/5 150/11 ever [5] 88/23 114/18 114/18 114/18 115/7 every [19] 14/20 60/23 81/24 83/17 84/6 84/14 87/23 90/2 90/2 90/3 112/3 113/12 113/14 127/20 132/7 135/25 136/5 136/22 140/21 everybody's [1] 124/10 everyday [1] 128/14 everyone [3] 7/14 87/21 135/20 everything [9] 29/17 49/3 87/19 93/25 112/5 127/11 137/12 138/2 141/23 evidence [67] 36/3 36/5 36/8 36/13 38/15 39/25 40/2 40/8 40/14 40/18 40/24 41/1 41/3 41/11 42/24 43/6 43/16 44/4 46/23 47/21 49/7 49/9 51/1 51/1 51/18 52/3 52/4 52/7 55/23 56/20 58/25 59/13 61/5 61/15 61/21 62/9 62/14 63/1 63/2 63/13 63/17 64/21 65/1 65/10 69/1 70/2 71/4 71/11 71/14 73/6 103/9 104/21 107/13 107/14 109/23 110/13 110/20 111/15 119/9 119/15 119/22 119/22 120/1 120/5 121/23 138/25

evidentiary [2] 14/19 15/10 exact [2] 29/1 137/17 exactly [2] 108/24 148/21 **examination** [10] 14/11 14/13 14/21 15/12 15/18 16/12 16/13 16/15 17/8 17/13 **examinations** [3] 12/7 13/8 16/23 example [40] 19/10 20/15 21/2 24/7 24/18 36/18 38/21 39/12 41/11 42/18 45/18 45/25 47/4 47/14 48/12 48/20 51/3 52/25 52/25 53/11 53/14 53/23 54/8 54/15 54/22 55/3 55/25 56/15 61/23 64/8 70/15 70/21 72/21 98/11 107/2 109/18 125/16 137/5 137/15 150/3 examples [2] 41/5 53/6 excited [1] 94/20 **excitement [1]** 93/19 **exclude [5]** 102/13 102/14 102/14 102/15 107/8 excluded [2] 108/19 109/2 **excludes [4]** 102/12 103/13 104/5 104/5 exclusive [1] 147/12 excuse [2] 93/5 96/14 **execute** [1] 42/3 **executing** [1] 148/1 **executive [2]** 26/4 54/19 **executives [11]** 16/1 42/1 42/2 67/17 67/24 72/16 72/25 85/25 94/22 113/2 113/2 **exercises** [1] 122/4 exhibits [15] 12/7 12/9 14/5 14/11 14/16 14/18 15/2 15/4 15/12 15/12 15/14 16/12 16/22 17/13 44/10 **existed [1]** 122/12 **existence** [1] 78/25 **existing [2]** 98/2 98/25 exists [3] 114/1 114/9 121/10 exiting [1] 142/21 expand [7] 39/7 50/13 58/8 59/3 72/19 91/21 95/2 expanding [2] 133/9 134/11 **expansion** [1] 97/25 **expect [6]** 13/4 16/18 58/17 121/1 121/13 133/19 **expense** [1] 76/7 expensive [3] 33/24 91/22 92/1

experience [25] 33/17 34/10 50/20 50/22 52/20 53/25 54/4 54/17 54/19 55/8 55/20 76/14 78/11 84/5 93/7 94/19 94/19 97/4 98/10 104/25 121/3 121/3 130/3 149/24 150/5 **experienced** [5] 66/17 72/14 72/15 76/20 77/17 **experiences** [1] 106/20 **expert [18]** 18/1 18/6 21/23 27/25 30/10 30/17 51/6 51/24 73/6 73/7 97/1 102/17 119/16 119/16 119/19 119/22 120/5 134/3 **expertise** [1] 73/13 experts [11] 30/18 74/16 74/17 85/25 115/23 116/10 116/12 116/25 119/15 120/3 130/15 **Expiration [1]** 152/17 **expire** [1] 100/5 expires [1] 100/2 explain [21] 41/11 42/2 42/18 51/6 53/22 53/24 54/3 54/18 56/1 57/3 57/16 57/25 63/19 63/21 64/1 65/11 74/5 94/7 94/7 137/16 142/2 explained [7] 49/16 51/13 54/20 55/13 62/5 64/21 137/1 explains [4] 45/2 45/3 48/8 52/10 exploded [1] 134/20 **explore [1]** 21/23 **explored** [1] 138/10 express [2] 38/7 38/11 expressed [4] 61/22 67/25 80/2 119/4 **expressing** [1] 39/23 **extensive [4]** 14/23 30/8 49/6 52/3 extent [5] 18/6 18/8 31/3 38/1 40/22 extra [3] 71/22 80/8 107/19 **extract** [1] 60/10 **extraordinarily [3]** 92/1 92/1 99/22 extraordinary [5] 60/4 87/18 92/19 96/5 98/4

F.3d [1] 27/11 face [5] 40/16 71/11 76/9 79/5

128/7 faced [1] 38/17 faces [2] 132/7 137/9 facie [5] 36/8 40/1 49/10 61/14 62/10 facilitate [1] 33/3 **facilities** [1] 144/5 facility [1] 94/18 facing [2] 41/18 141/21 fact [20] 28/19 51/14 70/18 74/23 93/2 102/13 106/22 117/18 118/14 121/5 124/24 126/22 128/11 133/8 133/9 133/20 135/10 137/1 144/13 145/5 factor [2] 95/24 100/8 factors [2] 96/3 99/10 facts [16] 31/7 36/9 63/16 101/6 figure [4] 22/17 23/15 24/14 102/21 103/9 105/7 110/9 113/2 113/3 113/7 121/14 122/3 124/7 129/11 130/20 **factually [1]** 119/7 Fahrenheit [1] 115/21 fail [6] 81/9 103/8 109/12 109/13 109/17 146/3 fails [3] 103/12 107/21 108/8 failure [3] 71/25 76/19 149/10 failures [2] 67/23 72/11 Fair [4] 12/4 13/15 16/8 25/15 falls [1] 126/2 familiar [1] 96/4 families [7] 33/22 34/11 35/10 81/20 100/5 123/9 143/1 family [4] 33/18 33/23 83/19 85/22 far [4] 37/19 89/14 107/13 148/6 farmer [1] 84/12 farmers [2] 85/17 123/5 **farther [5]** 106/17 106/18 106/18 107/15 107/15 fascia [1] 59/12 fast [1] 96/15 faster [2] 91/23 92/11 fastest [1] 133/5 fate [1] 99/15 favor [4] 28/15 78/9 79/4 82/8 favors [1] 99/7 Fe [6] 3/15 39/12 39/14 39/22 70/15 70/18 features [1] 55/16 FEDERAL [13] 1/3 2/3 2/4 2/8

105/9 152/3 FedExes [1] 120/20 feed [4] 33/21 35/10 80/8 81/20 feeding [1] 33/23 feel [2] 23/8 24/5 fees [1] 117/15 feet [3] 116/1 116/3 132/12 fell [2] 35/1 76/22 felt [2] 38/19 132/12 few [18] 16/19 53/6 83/7 90/13 94/16 96/1 97/7 101/4 102/3 104/24 105/13 122/2 128/9 130/5 131/12 131/24 134/1 142/19 fewer [1] 49/20 fifth [3] 4/7 69/5 143/17 fight [3] 88/17 116/7 128/23 24/15 filed [2] 35/6 129/24 filing [3] 11/17 12/2 84/22 **filings [1]** 113/12 filled [1] 78/13 final [3] 100/8 118/9 150/6 finally [4] 41/17 48/20 55/7 59/9 financial [3] 67/11 97/17 115/2 financing [1] 100/1 find [6] 23/14 54/22 55/6 83/9 106/12 106/12 finding [2] 56/10 57/4 fine [3] 23/20 32/23 123/24 firm [1] 57/24 firms [1] 112/24 first [40] 7/9 11/13 24/7 36/2 40/8 41/3 42/11 49/24 50/8 50/17 50/24 51/19 52/6 52/10 52/16 55/9 56/12 58/24 62/17 62/23 64/5 76/5 77/25 86/4 96/9 100/19 102/6 103/10 105/1 107/8 110/17 110/21 119/8 120/11 120/25 124/12 124/22 128/10 132/13 144/2 five [25] 39/19 58/3 74/14 87/20 90/6 107/2 107/20 108/15 108/17 108/25 109/8 109/19 110/6 113/9 114/6 114/9 114/10 114/10 114/13 115/18 117/25 135/2 136/23 139/13 148/24 five percent [1] 108/17 five-mile [5] 107/2 107/20 108/25 109/19 110/6 7/6 8/2 8/5 8/8 8/10 16/23 27/13 five-tenths [1] 114/10

fix [1] 62/12 fixed [1] 36/9 fixes [1] 36/10 flaw [1] 63/22 **flexibility [1]** 97/16 flexible [1] 16/13 flip [2] 32/21 121/11 floor [5] 2/22 44/23 44/24 45/4 49/4 floor-ceiling [2] 44/23 44/24 Florenz [8] 26/3 26/17 28/12 28/17 29/21 31/16 68/2 68/11 Florenz's [3] 27/8 27/15 29/10 Florida [1] 140/17 flourishing [1] 38/13 fluid [3] 25/7 25/9 25/12 **FM [1]** 47/15 focal [1] 70/18 focus [7] 38/18 62/13 89/5 98/10 124/10 137/1 149/8 focused [7] 111/1 111/6 111/7 114/22 115/3 115/6 115/6 folks [18] 31/14 83/11 86/12 90/6 90/8 91/13 97/14 98/8 98/8 98/10 103/18 104/2 104/7 105/21 114/2 121/6 121/19 123/9 folks that [1] 98/8 **follow [1]** 113/16 followed [2] 52/17 130/6 following [2] 36/22 76/4 followings [1] 147/21 food [16] 7/16 34/1 42/13 42/15 42/19 50/25 80/11 81/20 84/11 84/13 88/6 88/17 92/8 93/24 98/6 146/17 foods [13] 51/13 58/13 59/7 87/2 87/2 89/19 96/14 102/15 104/6 106/2 107/9 127/22 132/16 foot [1] 34/7 **footprint [7]** 54/9 59/2 88/12 89/25 91/8 140/10 140/13 force [1] 122/3 forced [1] 85/8 forces [1] 122/5 **foregoing [1]** 152/8 forgetting [1] 146/12 forgotten [1] 131/12 form [1] 39/21 format [13] 21/5 54/8 54/14

55/19 58/7 58/12 59/8 59/10 70/10 77/10 102/20 108/3 134/4 formats [5] 51/10 53/21 54/3 54/7 55/15 former [5] 83/18 83/25 84/2 99/2 115/9 forth [2] 30/13 136/20 **forthright** [1] 17/25 forward [6] 11/19 12/16 14/24 40/3 71/13 120/6 found [1] 81/18 founded [2] 86/5 139/20 founder [1] 139/21 four [14] 38/25 53/5 62/19 74/13 80/15 87/20 94/18 94/19 95/24 96/3 132/5 133/23 134/1 142/6 four-factor [1] 95/24 fourth [1] 141/7 Fox [4] 21/23 73/7 73/13 74/5 fraction [1] 71/20 fragile [1] 150/16 framework [6] 62/23 68/22 71/7 | fulfillment [1] 96/16 100/16 100/17 100/19 franchisees [1] 93/7 **Francisco [1]** 2/18 frankly [2] 116/13 145/21 Fred [13] 34/4 36/19 42/20 42/22 47/15 48/17 50/11 70/22 86/12 109/19 109/21 109/25 109/25 Fred Meyer [11] 34/4 42/20 42/22 47/15 50/11 70/22 86/12 109/19 109/21 109/25 109/25 Fred Meyer's [1] 48/17 free [1] 29/20 freeze [1] 150/19 frequently [5] 44/17 56/14 128/15 133/6 133/7 fresh [12] 41/12 58/25 59/1 59/3 80/11 87/2 89/20 93/23 102/14 133/10 134/11 134/12 fresher [5] 91/23 92/8 92/11 96/13 98/6 freshness [2] 88/24 105/6 Friday [9] 12/25 18/18 21/14 22/12 26/2 28/11 31/1 31/12 32/3 Friday's [1] 7/24 friends [1] 33/18 front [11] 12/12 32/25 36/14 36/15 41/6 41/21 44/7 46/3 46/6 53/5 55/12

frontline [5] 84/10 94/23 123/4 144/5 148/7 frozen [1] 146/17 fruits [1] 34/12 frustrate [1] 80/5 frustrated [1] 60/22 Fry's [1] 47/16 FTC [48] 8/11 13/22 13/24 23/18 25/13 29/14 30/2 32/11 33/12 35/2 35/21 38/6 38/7 38/9 39/7 39/23 49/6 57/12 62/5 66/22 67/1 67/9 68/12 79/19 80/25 99/17 99/24 105/10 124/17 126/25 127/3 127/21 129/15 129/16 130/1 134/16 136/16 136/18 137/6 138/3 138/21 146/8 146/12 147/5 149/7 150/8 150/10 150/12 **FTC's [1]** 76/16 fuel [2] 37/9 87/19 fulfill [1] 74/21 full [3] 35/16 35/25 82/9 fully [2] 73/4 134/2 functioning [1] 73/4 fundamental [7] 63/22 83/23 95/22 99/12 99/14 100/10 124/13 **fundamentally [4]** 54/4 55/8 58/11 142/18 further [8] 16/22 25/16 38/14 38/19 38/20 79/1 83/14 110/2 future [3] 76/1 103/3 133/3

G

gain [2] 123/10 133/16 gaining [1] 75/17 Galante [6] 28/1 29/25 30/17 30/22 31/2 31/10 Galante's [1] 28/5 Galisteo [1] 3/14 gallery [2] 7/20 9/15 game [2] 100/24 103/2 gap [5] 42/16 42/17 43/4 111/9 111/14 Gate [1] 2/18 qathered [1] 24/4 **Gatorade [3]** 51/3 51/9 137/15 Gatorade/water [1] 137/15 gave [1] 24/7 gears [2] 143/17 145/22 general [24] 2/13 2/17 2/21 3/2

G

general... [20] 3/6 3/13 4/16 9/12 10/9 36/22 74/20 80/15 90/5 95/14 131/8 133/1 133/8 133/8 133/24 134/2 134/5 134/10 134/15 137/20 General's [2] 3/10 134/9 **generate** [1] 58/3 generated [1] 133/22 generic [1] 79/14 geographic [18] 49/25 55/21 69/23 100/21 100/25 101/5 101/9 101/14 102/8 105/24 106/23 106/24 107/2 107/4 108/1 108/19 110/14 118/23 geographically [1] 77/2 geography [7] 90/24 106/6 106/7 108/6 108/7 108/9 109/7 **get [42]** 16/8 16/22 32/17 34/5 34/19 55/4 55/13 57/4 60/22 61/3 65/18 79/10 87/9 87/10 88/23 91/18 95/1 101/19 102/17 102/21 107/19 108/12 108/13 108/21 110/8 110/9 115/7 121/19 121/25 122/6 129/11 129/20 130/11 131/2 131/6 131/11 137/12 140/9 141/4 143/2 147/2 147/3 gets [2] 16/7 135/18 getting [18] 21/9 53/14 81/15 94/8 94/13 94/14 95/3 95/3 98/20 134/24 147/6 147/9 147/11 147/19 147/21 147/23 148/7 148/13 Giant [1] 93/12 giants [2] 132/20 139/15 gild [2] 105/25 105/25 give [3] 60/14 125/16 126/19 given [4] 15/8 17/4 28/6 123/4 gives [2] 91/10 140/22 giving [4] 17/6 27/22 87/4 148/3 **glad [1]** 31/10 glaring [1] 72/21 glass [1] 53/2 global [1] 99/4 **gloves [1]** 117/12 go [59] 16/25 17/19 20/11 24/17 29/17 31/12 38/17 38/25 41/8 41/23 45/22 46/4 46/12 46/18 50/2 53/18 55/10 58/14 60/9 60/12 63/10 64/16 65/17 66/8 94/17 95/15 99/22 104/5 104/18

107/24 116/1 117/10 117/15 117/15 117/16 121/12 121/13 121/15 121/20 123/13 124/14 124/14 124/19 125/5 125/11 126/14 129/20 131/2 131/6 131/8 137/10 137/19 142/16 142/23 143/9 144/10 145/9 146/11 149/3 go-it-alone [1] 142/16 goal [3] 42/15 104/24 123/25 goes [16] 23/9 30/8 62/2 84/8 84/15 117/11 117/15 118/5 118/7 123/10 125/9 126/9 137/24 141/10 149/22 150/15 going [137] gold [2] 52/1 56/22 **Golden [1]** 2/18 **Goliaths [1]** 142/10 gone [3] 89/21 101/24 113/8 good [45] 7/5 8/1 8/7 8/9 8/15 8/16 8/17 8/20 8/22 8/24 9/1 9/3 9/5 9/6 9/8 9/17 9/18 9/20 9/21 9/23 9/24 10/4 10/10 10/11 11/9 11/11 13/19 13/20 16/4 22/25 23/1 30/25 32/16 56/5 87/2 87/5 87/7 87/8 87/8 87/11 115/15 122/9 123/20 123/21 130/9 goods [3] 87/19 137/20 139/2 Google [1] 51/13 **Gordon [2]** 2/16 9/2 got [8] 31/13 94/18 106/11 108/21 122/1 138/10 150/4 150/5 Gotchal [1] 13/21 Gotshal [4] 4/4 4/7 4/13 9/16 gotten [4] 7/11 33/23 43/7 102/18 gourmet [1] 50/16 governing [1] 27/14 **Government [31]** 15/13 16/23 17/6 31/3 99/13 99/14 100/13 101/15 101/16 102/5 102/11 102/23 103/21 104/14 105/2 105/10 105/16 105/17 105/18 105/23 107/1 107/22 107/22 109/2 109/7 109/16 110/2 110/5 116/12 118/21 120/6 Government's [9] 16/9 103/1 107/14 109/11 110/2 112/10 118/19 119/18 121/7 grab [1] 53/18 graffiti [1] 101/23

Grand [2] 67/12 77/17 granting [1] 150/20 graphic [3] 44/24 46/3 46/6 great [3] 12/10 30/7 138/21 greater [7] 45/2 96/20 97/15 97/16 106/14 109/15 115/18 green [1] 19/19 **Grieco [1]** 106/9 grocer [4] 52/15 52/16 85/22 134/1 groceries [19] 33/19 33/21 34/5 34/12 51/16 85/20 86/16 104/13 117/8 117/12 129/20 130/11 130/24 131/17 131/22 132/3 135/13 136/1 136/5 grocers [11] 54/15 54/15 54/23 85/14 92/18 106/13 132/18 133/18 134/20 135/12 149/17 grocery [81] grocery-based [1] 121/5 **Groff [3]** 42/1 46/22 111/3 gross [1] 117/2 ground [4] 47/2 61/21 102/21 103/9 group [4] 5/2 10/5 61/24 130/7 grow [5] 76/4 85/16 147/17 148/21 148/25 growing [2] 131/18 133/5 growth [1] 89/22 guarantee [1] 127/1 **guardrails** [1] 16/20 guidance [2] 12/15 18/23 guided [1] 112/16 **guidelines** [1] 57/12 quiding [1] 86/15 gum [1] 51/15 **GUPPI [2]** 115/20 116/5 Н **H-E-B [4]** 95/14 140/16 140/21

H-E-B [4] 95/14 140/16 140/21 141/2
Hacked [1] 104/11
had [29] 11/2 12/12 12/22 22/12 26/21 26/21 27/18 28/3 28/19 31/12 32/2 52/15 62/24 67/3 67/9 67/10 72/13 74/24 76/20 76/25 79/6 79/7 81/1 110/9 130/5 133/14 134/23 139/9 146/24
Haggen [8] 66/25 67/3 67/5 147/12 149/8 149/11 149/13 149/15

headlines [1] 88/15

Н

Haggen's [1] 80/25 half [6] 26/5 31/19 78/13 95/2 104/4 122/5

Hall [8] 2/7 8/5 11/5 18/15 24/7 33/15 66/1 149/25

Hambleton [2] 27/10 31/22 hand [11] 18/14 19/9 20/15 27/5 45/23 67/17 91/5 96/24 109/5 116/18 136/14

hand-selected [1] 67/17 handful [3] 80/14 111/11 144/23

handoff [1] 95/4 **hands [2]** 75/21 98/16

happen [16] 7/10 11/25 18/13 29/12 57/1 63/24 64/17 99/19 99/25 100/2 100/6 113/20 113/24 123/8 125/8 142/3

happened [3] 32/4 96/25 132/8 happening [4] 35/17 64/19 131/20 135/20

happens [8] 96/6 99/19 118/8 118/13 118/13 142/24 148/16 150/17

hard [3] 20/17 142/19 143/11 harm [30] 36/3 36/5 38/18 39/9 40/3 50/13 57/21 58/15 58/20 60/6 62/21 62/25 63/7 63/9 65/8 65/25 66/11 69/14 69/15 69/22 78/22 79/23 81/8 81/15 99/11 100/22 110/16 115/16 144/19 144/24

harmed [2] 50/4 71/5 harms [3] 69/19 77/23 99/11 Harper [1] 3/2 Harris [2] 98/9 113/17 has [82]

hasn't [1] 105/10 have [170]

haven't [2] 130/13 143/20 having [6] 38/4 52/10 55/18

61/2 72/15 75/19

he [28] 18/4 18/8 47/6 48/8 48/11 56/8 57/3 57/21 58/1 58/12 62/2 63/19 63/20 86/20 102/19 112/18 115/15 116/14 116/20 117/18 117/25 118/3 141/19 141/22 142/5 143/13 146/24 146/24

he'll [4] 86/18 141/19 142/2 142/9

he's [3] 78/8 87/17 144/13

head [21] 10/12 40/9 40/9 40/19 40/19 40/19 40/21 40/21 40/23 40/23 52/4 52/4 65/2 65/2 65/4 65/4 67/14 81/11 114/20 114/20 114/21 114/21

headquarters [1] 86/7 healthy [1] 80/11 hear [67] 18/25 30/4 30/7 30/10 31/10 33/10 36/13 41/24 43/6 46/23 47/21 50/9 52/7 53/21 53/23 55/25 58/18 78/17 80/13 81/2 86/18 86/25 87/15 88/19 90/4 92/4 92/18 93/13 93/18 93/22 94/14 94/21 95/1 100/6 103/16 104/22 106/8 107/14 108/23 109/23 111/2 111/3 111/17 111/20 115/1 115/19 115/20 119/9 124/8 124/24 127/12 130/15 130/17 130/20 131/15 135/11 135/15 139/3 139/8 140/14 141/17 141/22 143/10 143/19 147/22 149/11

150/20
heard [19] 31/1 31/12 66/19
85/19 95/9 100/24 108/10
121/22 125/4 127/8 127/15
127/21 133/1 135/23 143/22
146/8 148/13 149/7 150/8
hearing [23] 1/14 7/9 7/21 7/25
12/3 41/2 42/23 49/6 53/20
55/14 55/22 58/18 59/1 59/22
61/5 61/7 82/5 89/7 116/20
138/19 150/12 150/14 152/5

heavily [1] 81/6 heightened [1] 71/10 held [1] 69/5

help [6] 69/17 87/25 126/20 141/20 148/21 149/24

helped [1] 148/25

helpful [3] 36/11 64/5 110/7

helpfully [1] 86/10 **helping [1]** 35/9

her [27] 9/13 26/6 26/22 26/23 26/25 27/4 27/18 27/19 27/20 27/21 27/23 27/23 28/12 29/21 31/5 68/3 80/25 83/21 93/15 94/15 94/16 95/10 135/19 137/17 148/17 149/5 149/22

here [62] 7/6 7/17 11/11 12/16 15/24 16/2 18/8 20/3 22/5 22/10 22/12 22/13 23/4 28/15 28/21 34/4 35/18 35/23 36/18 37/25 38/21 39/14 41/1 42/18 44/19 47/10 47/14 48/1 48/16 48/23 50/6 50/21 55/3 57/4 57/24 58/7 60/24 62/10 65/8 73/5 77/9 93/10 95/18 95/25 102/9 103/2 107/24 110/23 115/13 121/25 122/1 124/13 129/10 129/16 129/17 134/6 134/7 138/3 141/12 141/18 148/16 149/20 here's [8] 48/21 99/12 109/18 110/5 111/23 113/11 133/4 137/18

Herrera [2] 3/12 8/18 **Hesse [5]** 22/6 22/24 23/2 25/25 31/4

Hey [1] 90/20

high [5] 42/3 42/4 44/2 44/24 45/21

high-low [2] 42/3 42/4 high-price [1] 44/24 high-priced [2] 44/2 45/21 higher [12] 38/17 45/10 61/1 85/5 85/10 97/15 108/17 109/8 109/8 109/10 125/23 143/13

highlight [1] 124/1 highlighted [1] 19/19 Hill [29] 18/1 18/2 18/5 18/6 51/6 56/8 56/12 56/20 56/25 57/2 57/16 57/20 57/25 58/6 58/8 59/8 70/9 77/6 97/2 103/5 112/17 115/14 116/13 117/2 117/4 117/17 117/23 118/8 134/4

Hill's [9] 59/5 70/4 102/17 108/3 108/5 108/7 112/11 118/2 118/19

hinge [1] 62/11 hire [1] 74/20 hiring [1] 72/15 his [17] 28/1 28/9 31/2 48/9

56/20 57/4 57/25 58/1 58/8 58/10 59/8 59/12 73/13 112/23 118/3 118/9 143/10

Historically [1] 72/6

history [6] 34/23 48/18 99/20 99/21 113/7 124/20

hodgepodge [1] 73/9 **hold [2]** 107/22 110/9

holding [1] 31/22 holiday [3] 47/6 48/15 93/10 holidays [1] 48/17

(18) Haggen's - holidays

home [8] 51/4 76/24 87/10 107/24 121/8 121/15 131/10 131/11 hometown [1] 105/12 Honor [181] Honor's [3] 18/23 86/19 129/22 **HONORABLE [1]** 1/17 hop [1] 131/12 hope [4] 11/11 11/20 90/6 143/2 hoping [1] 150/24 hospital [2] 116/15 117/4 Hospitals [1] 116/15 hourly [2] 117/10 120/14 hours [4] 14/17 15/6 18/9 121/19 House [1] 105/22 household [1] 106/21 how [47] 15/15 15/17 21/10 23/15 24/2 24/4 25/11 28/23 28/23 47/12 49/1 53/24 54/3 56/13 70/13 78/4 82/13 82/17 83/24 88/6 89/12 96/20 96/20 96/20 97/22 104/11 108/12 110/8 112/11 115/25 116/2 116/24 118/10 118/10 120/23 126/7 126/25 136/1 138/19 138/21 140/15 140/17 146/4 149/2 149/19 150/4 150/12 however [1] 45/6 HPR [7] 44/3 45/2 45/3 45/8 45/24 46/2 46/7 huge [1] 139/6 Hughes [2] 100/16 100/19 **human [1]** 119/12 Humayun [1] 61/23 hundred [1] 101/22 hundreds [8] 70/3 71/3 72/1 73/19 74/15 80/7 123/8 126/6 hundredths [2] 114/10 114/13 Hunger [1] 88/9 hunt [1] 54/19 hurt [1] 144/18 hypothetical [7] 51/25 56/21 56/22 57/2 108/10 108/11 109/12 I'd [2] 62/13 66/3 **I'II [8]** 8/3 13/16 33/14 66/1

102/3 103/7 113/25 128/9 **I'm [25]** 11/16 15/21 15/24 16/6

16/7 17/11 17/12 21/13 22/5 25/19 25/20 30/19 31/9 32/3 32/20 37/18 45/16 90/12 96/14 103/8 110/23 110/25 122/1 124/4 129/6 I've [3] 122/1 138/14 151/1 Idaho [2] 46/25 46/25 idea [7] 13/9 14/17 101/21 103/22 125/20 135/25 138/12 ideas [1] 150/4 identified [3] 44/12 58/2 73/8 identifies [2] 42/12 117/6 identity [1] 73/22 ignore [2] 104/14 104/19 ignores [1] 117/17 iii [1] 30/12 **IL [1]** 3/3 ilk [1] 85/15 illegal [4] 70/20 70/23 77/8 77/18 **ILLINOIS** [5] 3/1 3/2 35/3 47/1 74/3 Illumina [2] 69/4 69/13 **illustrate** [1] 51/7 **illustrated [1]** 137/15 image [1] 91/5 immediate [1] 79/23 **immediately [1]** 29/13 impact [8] 37/22 46/6 60/4 85/16 119/23 135/7 142/25 144/2 impacted [2] 43/23 64/9 impasse [2] 18/23 22/1 impeachment [1] 14/12 impending [1] 49/1 imperceptible [2] 42/16 85/1 imperceptibly [1] 43/4 implications [1] 122/21 **implied [1]** 93/18 import [1] 95/6 importance [2] 129/9 133/2 important [10] 20/23 24/13 60/2 independently [1] 78/5 73/14 83/10 92/22 128/3 137/9 140/18 147/15 importantly [5] 84/5 90/21 95/16 116/22 150/5 **improve [2]** 66/15 71/18 improved [3] 67/2 96/16 122/25 improvement [1] 76/22 improvements [4] 35/13 143/24 145/10 145/11

improving [1] 97/23

inadequacies [1] 93/16 **inadequate [1]** 69/18 inappropriate [1] 26/6 **INC [3]** 1/7 5/2 27/11 incentive [7] 46/13 46/19 57/24 58/4 72/9 75/9 75/22 incentives [1] 112/19 **incipiency** [1] 81/12 include [6] 7/17 17/13 53/7 58/8 142/20 142/21 included [5] 58/22 66/13 106/3 109/22 109/24 includes [9] 27/15 28/1 40/4 49/3 58/13 108/4 110/10 110/10 148/2 including [10] 23/14 26/19 71/25 74/1 74/11 74/17 78/4 105/15 132/15 135/3 inclusive [2] 110/3 110/4 incomplete [1] 28/17 inconsistency [1] 29/25 inconsistent [2] 27/23 28/13 Incorporated [1] 7/8 incorrect [3] 27/18 28/18 147/7 **incorrectly [1]** 100/13 increase [11] 34/6 49/17 49/23 50/5 57/8 57/24 65/21 65/22 77/13 77/18 77/19 increased [5] 40/17 46/19 89/3 95/5 117/14 increases [3] 40/12 77/14 98/24 increasing [1] 34/9 increasingly [2] 43/7 131/18 incredible [3] 17/10 142/12 143/7 incremental [1] 83/21 incumbents' [1] 90/11 incur [1] 75/22 indeed [2] 42/23 116/25 independent [4] 72/7 78/14 92/20 92/24 **INDEX [1]** 5/22 indexes [1] 88/8 indicated [2] 11/10 16/11 indicia [2] 51/21 55/17 industry [21] 36/23 49/22 84/22 85/13 85/24 86/3 94/19 101/6 106/25 116/19 116/23 117/6 128/25 134/22 135/6 135/16 135/20 138/20 142/16 148/18 149/23

industry-specific [1] 116/19 inevitable [1] 85/16 inexperience [1] 72/21 inexplicably [3] 84/17 85/11 85/19 Infinger [2] 5/7 10/2 **infirmities** [1] 71/12 inflation [4] 87/18 87/21 105/14 128/8 influence [1] 122/8 information [14] 9/14 12/20 12/21 13/2 19/22 20/2 23/24 24/2 24/4 24/7 29/4 33/4 79/25 80/5 infrastructure [4] 75/23 93/8 96/13 123/1 **inherently [1]** 49/18 initiatives [2] 139/4 139/5 injunction [19] 1/14 7/10 69/21 79/2 79/4 80/12 82/5 92/16 95/19 95/24 96/3 97/9 99/9 100/7 102/22 102/22 141/11 150/20 152/5 injury [3] 114/14 114/15 114/16 innovation [3] 35/13 40/17 52/19 inputs [6] 42/12 116/11 116/12 116/24 117/9 118/12 inquiry [1] 35/25 insecurity [1] 84/13 insist [2] 84/17 85/6 insists [1] 107/23 **Instacart [1]** 131/13 installed [1] 32/2 instead [4] 13/13 38/4 128/23 131/8 institutional [1] 85/23 institutionalizing [1] 43/19 instrument [1] 105/9 insubstantial [1] 78/24 integration [1] 52/17 **intellectual** [1] 73/10 **Intelligence [1]** 135/17 intend [5] 13/24 14/2 17/25 31/2 75/4 **intending** [1] 16/3 **intends** [1] 14/13 intensity [1] 69/2 interchangeable [1] 130/3 interest [9] 79/19 81/5 96/5 96/5 97/10 99/6 126/24 141/12

141/13 **interested [1]** 140/3 interesting [2] 100/15 138/17 interfere [1] 17/12 interim [2] 20/19 20/19 internal [2] 20/1 24/21 International [1] 22/13 interpret [4] 29/22 29/23 29/23 29/24 interpretation [1] 28/6 interrelated [1] 20/6 interrelationship [1] 106/6 **intertwined [1]** 106/25 introduce [4] 8/3 22/6 40/8 51/19 **introduced** [1] 58/7 introduces [1] 102/19 introducing [1] 74/6 intuitive [2] 91/16 104/7 **intuitively [1]** 104/8 invaded [1] 132/19 invest [5] 84/3 112/6 135/2 144/7 145/9 invested [1] 45/15 investing [4] 45/20 64/23 64/24 83/16 investment [14] 64/4 65/18 75/12 75/19 80/14 80/17 80/20 80/21 83/21 83/24 83/25 96/11 111/13 132/23 investments [5] 64/14 64/23 75/25 122/24 143/23 investors [1] 133/5 involve [1] 54/17 involved [1] 150/7 involvement [3] 88/9 89/16 89/23 involving [1] 69/14 lowa [1] 80/18 **irony [1]** 105/8 irrelevant [3] 56/5 110/11 111/11 irreparable [1] 99/11

Irreversibly [1] 80/4

116/18 117/2 117/5

isn't [9] 39/9 105/4 105/6

112/25 115/13 122/20 140/7

Israel [6] 30/21 30/22 70/19

Israel's [5] 17/21 18/3 18/10

is [456]

140/8 147/6

118/1 118/15

14/10 16/17 17/16 17/20 20/3 20/4 20/8 22/15 23/4 25/18 26/2 26/13 28/19 28/21 28/22 29/9 30/2 30/6 30/11 31/3 31/4 35/15 69/22 69/25 149/14 issues [12] 11/3 11/8 11/12 12/6 14/9 14/19 14/19 15/9 15/10 16/14 45/17 141/10 issuing [1] 141/11 it [239] it's [63] 16/12 17/1 19/12 19/18 21/2 21/4 21/4 21/7 21/20 22/7 23/18 23/20 23/22 24/5 24/18 25/3 25/4 25/7 30/7 50/10 62/3 62/6 64/5 64/8 64/8 64/10 64/11 65/3 65/16 65/21 91/15 94/21 96/18 100/3 100/16 101/4 101/24 105/8 106/20 108/20 110/1 110/3 110/4 112/4 114/9 114/10 114/23 114/24 115/21 117/9 119/13 122/6 122/7 122/14 126/10 129/9 135/6 136/9 144/18 145/14 145/20 150/23 151/6 items [7] 27/15 48/25 52/11 56/17 72/3 83/15 128/15 its [45] 31/22 35/2 39/25 42/21 42/22 43/11 43/17 43/24 45/12 48/16 51/17 52/17 66/23 72/22 75/12 75/13 75/16 75/18 81/11 84/7 85/24 86/7 86/8 86/16 99/17 109/25 111/24 122/4 122/5 125/10 128/1 128/2 128/3 132/14 136/8 138/3 138/3 138/4 139/21 141/25 142/1 142/4 142/18 143/13 144/8 itself [4] 70/8 130/22 140/4 147/4

issue [29] 13/5 13/17 14/4 14/6

jacks [1] 109/25
James [1] 2/8
Jamie [1] 9/6
Jayme [1] 2/12
Jeff [2] 3/12 8/18
Jeff Herrera [1] 8/18
Jefferson [1] 83/7
jessup [3] 5/19 5/21 152/15
jettisoned [1] 80/21
Jewel [1] 80/18
Jewel-Osco [1] 80/18

jibe [1] 105/7 jill [3] 5/19 5/21 152/15 job [8] 67/3 80/25 84/10 99/17 120/11 121/20 123/4 135/19 iobs [8] 81/19 85/18 95/7 99/25 120/13 123/5 144/22 145/7 Joe [1] 139/21 **Joe's [7]** 54/15 54/19 54/24 95/15 104/7 106/1 107/8 John [3] 4/1 9/11 47/5 joined [3] 35/2 133/17 141/20 joint [1] 11/17 jokingly [1] 135/18 Jon [1] 60/21 Jonathan [2] 5/5 10/2 Josh [2] 9/10 14/5 Joshua [3] 4/10 5/6 10/1 Joshua Podoll [1] 10/1 Journal [2] 88/16 131/23 judge [2] 1/18 82/8 judgment [1] 67/21 **July [3]** 9/13 27/3 27/15 July 9th [1] 27/15 jump [1] 39/18 jumps [1] 39/8 June [2] 26/18 74/23 June 6th [1] 26/18 jurisdiction [2] 21/11 23/7 jurisdictions [1] 21/10 just [85] Justice [2] 3/19 8/14 justify [1] 97/9 justifying [1] 35/24

K

Kaye [1] 4/11 Kayser [3] 3/16 3/17 8/12 keep [5] 35/11 67/3 120/24 127/1 129/2 keeps [4] 98/13 98/13 98/14 110/22 Kepner [1] 68/5 key [9] 23/4 28/22 55/16 111/24 117/6 120/10 124/6 129/12 138/8 **Khvastunov** [1] 106/10 kids [1] 131/6 kind [6] 100/15 114/24 116/16 139/6 142/22 143/4 kinds [1] 143/1 King [5] 30/24 47/14 48/4 48/23

49/1 King Soopers [2] 48/23 49/1 Kings [1] 47/14 Kinney [3] 135/16 136/3 137/16 large-format [1] 58/7 Kinney's [1] 137/23 kiosk [1] 49/4 know [30] 11/1 12/12 16/5 22/11 25/21 26/10 28/8 28/15 31/24 31/24 32/2 65/17 85/20 86/12 103/4 103/7 104/7 104/8 106/11 108/12 108/21 119/25 120/23 129/15 145/2 145/14 146/4 147/16 150/8 151/5 knowing [1] 87/3 knowledge [3] 26/21 85/24 149/23 known [8] 14/23 21/2 21/8 23/21 74/13 90/18 93/1 116/21 Kraft [3] 125/18 125/19 139/23 **KROGER** [181] **Kroger Company [1]** 7/7 Kroger's [22] 30/14 34/3 42/8 42/25 43/21 43/22 45/12 52/14 60/21 65/19 71/18 84/25 85/2 85/21 86/21 111/23 112/13 114/13 114/18 114/25 124/23 136/19 Kroger-Albertsons [2] 77/14

120/11

label [14] 41/13 53/9 53/10

74/12 76/8 87/7 93/4 93/25

Ks [1] 41/11 Kuester [1] 4/9

96/22 97/25 98/1 98/3 98/20 147/20 labels [1] 95/2 labor [30] 59/14 69/24 72/5 77/21 77/23 78/3 78/12 78/15 78/23 88/25 107/24 119/2 119/6 119/12 119/17 119/20 120/7 120/21 120/23 121/1 121/9 121/13 121/16 121/20 122/3 122/14 144/20 144/24 145/2 145/3 labyrinthine [1] 99/23

lack [1] 93/17 lacks [1] 73/1 landscape [3] 127/11 129/8 137/8

large [14] 7/12 58/7 58/12 59/8

59/10 70/10 77/9 92/25 102/19 106/14 108/3 134/4 135/9 144/14

larger [2] 109/12 126/10 largest [5] 34/22 36/25 59/15 93/2 95/13

Larkins [1] 3/17 **Las [1]** 3/11 **LaSalle** [1] 3/3

last [25] 16/17 17/16 17/20 27/7 33/24 43/6 72/17 74/25 85/13 86/20 87/19 88/14 88/16 89/4 90/16 91/13 106/10 113/8 113/25 128/8 132/4 132/9 132/11 134/21 139/13

lasting [1] 60/5 late [1] 74/23

later [7] 11/18 11/22 21/24 30/5 50/9 93/13 111/4

Laura [4] 2/7 8/5 18/15 66/1 **Laura Hall [2]** 8/5 18/15 law [16] 5/2 10/5 27/10 52/1 57/10 57/13 62/21 63/1 65/10 69/19 82/8 101/6 103/9 113/2

113/3 124/8 laws [2] 37/21 79/20 lawsuit [1] 35/9 lawsuits [1] 35/6 lawyer [1] 14/20

lawyers' [1] 61/20 **lay [2]** 30/10 144/5 layer [1] 144/12

layoffs [1] 142/20

layout [2] 73/21 145/15 lead [3] 66/17 67/4 78/10

leader [1] 111/6

leadership [2] 111/18 149/4 leads [3] 49/9 121/18 129/3

leaking [1] 136/7 leaks [1] 136/12 **leaning [1]** 107/23

learn [3] 133/20 146/12 147/1

learned [1] 111/9

least [4] 11/7 67/13 75/8 121/4 leave [3] 31/12 32/7 121/12

left [11] 11/12 20/18 30/22 36/14 44/9 48/4 50/7 56/15 108/23 109/5 122/2

left-hand [1] 109/5 legacy [1] 74/18 legal [2] 68/22 71/7

legally [1] 119/6 less [18] 14/18 22/18 34/13 39/2 39/20 40/17 64/10 75/9 75/22 76/1 77/16 91/22 104/10 108/17 125/15 125/15 125/21 133/6

less-than-comfortable [1] 22/18

lessen [6] 40/16 49/19 56/11 59/20 69/8 119/19

lessening [4] 40/22 61/10 66/6 81/13

let [20] 8/3 21/13 24/3 26/10 61/25 82/1 99/15 99/17 99/18 110/15 124/22 125/16 130/20 134/5 140/11 143/17 143/18 143/25 146/6 147/8

let's [29] 26/9 26/14 32/14 37/24 37/24 38/20 39/11 39/12 40/2 40/18 41/4 59/17 68/22 70/13 82/18 86/2 94/3 95/18 97/13 98/10 100/8 102/6 108/3 108/6 108/7 110/18 115/11 121/11 121/11

letter [1] 27/17

letting [2] 28/15 78/10 level [6] 65/19 70/7 76/13 111/11 117/5 142/24

levels [4] 57/11 57/17 57/21 125/2

leverage [8] 34/17 59/18 59/21 61/11 120/2 122/4 122/8 144/19

leveraged [1] 133/15

license [3] 73/17 74/13 98/2

licensed [1] 21/9

licenses [4] 73/11 100/3 147/12 147/19

Lidl [2] 90/5 134/19

Lieberman [1] 111/17 **lifeblood** [1] 98/13

light [3] 103/8 104/21 114/6

lightly [1] 138/12

like [41] 13/1 14/16 15/18 18/23 19/9 19/15 21/22 25/14 29/21 37/15 37/17 37/20 62/3 62/13 66/3 68/24 78/16 80/24 81/16 90/7 90/20 93/11 108/24 112/4 118/4 121/8 121/19 124/18 128/3 133/1 134/19 137/10 137/11 137/21 138/8 139/9

140/16 141/8 142/10 145/11

150/13

likelihood [10] 20/25 62/25 67/18 69/15 99/11 100/8 101/11 107/25 118/25 143/4 likely [13] 16/21 21/3 49/18 49/21 59/4 60/14 66/6 69/7 71/5 72/12 81/24 121/3 143/4 likewise [1] 68/14 lily [2] 105/25 105/25 **limbo [1]** 100/1 limit [3] 15/13 80/10 139/24

limited [10] 17/4 25/19 50/15 55/1 58/9 59/1 61/5 68/6 129/16 129/17

limits [2] 87/21 142/7 line [9] 33/8 40/3 40/4 76/8 87/23 101/19 103/4 115/9 148/10

lines [2] 40/10 131/21 **lips [1]** 48/11

Lisa [1] 135/16

Lisa Kinney [1] 135/16 list [3] 26/4 48/24 49/3

listed [3] 41/21 46/2 47/14

lists [1] 74/19

litany [1] 71/25

Literally [1] 101/2

literature [1] 117/5

litigation [2] 10/12 11/25 little [16] 20/17 26/11 29/20 37/24 38/1 43/21 76/21 78/19

79/17 86/2 96/24 102/9 116/13 124/5 129/12 145/3

live [3] 88/4 131/7 145/19

LLC [1] 5/2

LLP [5] 3/17 4/2 4/4 4/7 4/11 local [20] 22/12 36/3 38/2 38/16 38/19 39/19 55/24 56/2 56/3 57/5 57/17 58/2 58/5 84/11 85/17 88/6 92/9 98/11 121/20 123/5

locally [1] 86/12

locations [3] 25/5 72/18 97/16

lodestar [1] 111/21

log [1] 7/23

logic [1] 65/10

logo [1] 44/12

long [6] 28/23 67/25 137/1 138/16 141/16 141/24

long-term [4] 67/25 138/16 141/16 141/24

longer [4] 46/13 46/15 69/7

139/22

look [21] 11/19 29/10 37/20 37/21 38/13 39/11 40/23 40/24 63/23 70/13 90/7 99/20 108/24 120/9 120/23 127/17 130/9 140/1 140/6 141/8 142/19

looked [1] 137/17

looking [5] 30/19 44/13 57/16 114/25 127/3

looks [4] 90/20 112/4 112/18 130/19

lose [8] 41/22 60/5 60/13 76/3 77/6 77/11 77/11 144/19 losing [10] 45/12 46/16 47/17 80/25 81/19 88/17 88/18 126/15 135/9 136/7

loss [5] 76/6 76/21 79/5 81/22 143/7

losses [2] 84/11 123/4 lost [2] 46/20 69/2

lot [20] 7/11 16/5 16/21 18/7 18/25 30/5 32/6 41/10 64/6 88/19 90/7 103/16 106/8 130/19 137/8 139/10 140/5 140/7 140/8 150/4

love [1] 114/24 low [8] 42/3 42/4 72/15 75/11 98/14 110/22 127/2 128/19 **Lowe's [3]** 120/19 121/8 121/15 lower [28] 34/8 40/17 41/15 44/9 44/11 46/8 46/8 46/14 48/1 48/11 84/3 85/2 85/3 85/5 90/10 92/7 96/10 112/7 124/23 125/1 126/12 128/6 129/1 133/16 137/21 139/1 139/2 139/5

lowered [2] 46/17 96/18 lowering [6] 44/5 46/9 112/7 128/12 128/14 128/17

lowers [2] 98/5 98/23

lowest [1] 44/1

loval [2] 103/24 147/20 loyalty [2] 41/15 75/2

Lucas [2] 3/9 8/23

Lucas Tucker [1] 8/23

Lucero [1] 48/9

Lucky [1] 54/23

lucrative [1] 132/23

Lumber [2] 27/10 31/22

Luna [2] 4/6 9/22

lunch [4] 26/7 26/9 31/25 151/6

Macy's [3] 120/20 121/16 121/21 made [15] 32/7 50/18 66/18 84/21 85/7 108/18 112/21 128/17 132/17 132/22 138/13 140/2 140/13 146/8 149/18 **Mafaz [1]** 92/4 Mafaz Maharoof [1] 92/4 magnified [2] 129/8 132/8 magnifies [1] 74/6 magnitude [1] 125/8 **Maharoof** [1] 92/4 main [2] 60/14 150/11 **Maine [1]** 5/9 Mainigi [9] 5/5 6/5 9/25 90/13 94/15 115/1 119/3 122/23 123/22 maintain [1] 72/19 maintained [2] 56/13 84/15 maintaining [1] 89/9 **major [1]** 78/16 majority [1] 14/9 majors [2] 78/20 95/10 make [34] 14/1 16/6 17/24 21/13 22/18 22/18 23/23 32/4 43/17 49/1 50/23 74/19 80/13 80/22 81/7 90/21 90/21 95/4 104/9 104/20 104/21 110/9 110/12 126/25 130/5 131/9 134/14 140/5 143/14 144/8 144/22 146/4 146/11 149/24 makes [10] 38/14 43/12 49/20 56/3 62/2 69/16 78/3 98/6 112/15 126/14 making [6] 33/25 75/25 85/7 96/5 139/6 146/9 manage [2] 16/6 101/12 managed [1] 101/20 management [5] 7/15 66/17 67/3 112/17 112/22 manager [1] 62/4 Manges [3] 4/4 4/7 4/13 manner [2] 31/17 63/5

manufacturing [2] 37/10 144/5 many [20] 11/7 22/21 34/15 68/8 70/1 71/5 72/13 73/1 77/12 77/25 87/24 99/13 115/25 118/10 118/10 133/10 133/10 134/18 136/10 149/3 map [7] 37/17 70/16 70/18

92/13 110/5 110/6 140/6

maps [1] 138/3 Marc [1] 111/17 **Marc Lieberman [1]** 111/17 March [2] 76/23 135/1 margin [8] 112/20 113/8 113/12 113/14 113/19 113/22 116/2 116/24 marginal [1] 57/23

margins [12] 13/2 85/9 87/23 117/1 117/2 118/1 118/1 118/4 118/12 118/14 118/15 139/10 Mariano's [2] 47/15 74/1

Mark [5] 4/13 9/16 22/4 30/1 67/14

Mark McGowan [1] 67/14 Mark Perry [2] 9/16 30/1 market [156]

marketing [3] 61/24 87/16 93/24

marketplace [1] 23/10 markets [52] 36/4 36/6 42/14 44/21 49/8 50/6 54/17 56/9 57/5 57/6 57/7 57/18 57/19 58/2 58/5 58/20 68/8 69/14 70/1 70/3 70/9 70/10 70/13 70/19 71/3 71/6 72/1 74/2 75/1 77/8 77/14 77/18 77/23 77/25 78/16 94/10 100/23 101/17 102/13 102/25 107/4 108/24 109/3 109/11 110/14 110/14 114/1 114/8 122/19 125/17 125/18 142/21

Mart [1] 106/2

MARYLAND [4] 3/5 3/6 9/4 35/3 Massachusetts [1] 4/11 massive [1] 68/5 match [9] 42/17 43/8 44/16 44/17 44/20 45/20 90/20 111/25 112/2

matched [1] 124/8 matching [1] 43/25 Matt [3] 9/8 65/14 65/23 matter [9] 7/6 32/9 60/1 74/16 83/15 115/21 115/22 117/20 127/13

matters [6] 7/24 87/5 144/15 145/17 145/18 145/19 Matthew [2] 4/9 83/5 **Matthew Wolf [1]** 83/5 max [1] 64/23 maximizing [1] 112/24 may [35] 14/19 16/15 19/16 22/7 22/8 22/17 25/25 28/5

30/15 32/4 32/17 37/20 38/7 51/3 68/15 80/5 81/14 81/22 82/24 114/23 123/13 123/15 124/5 125/21 128/13 131/8 131/9 131/11 133/1 138/3 138/21 142/21 144/9 145/11 150/12

maybe [3] 89/2 99/13 111/4 McDonald's [1] 120/19 McGowan [1] 67/14 McMullen [5] 56/1 65/15 86/17 87/1 111/2

McPherson [2] 60/21 78/7 **MD [1]** 3/7 me [23] 8/13 9/9 16/7 16/8 21/13 24/3 26/10 32/3 93/5

96/14 101/21 101/22 124/22 125/16 129/3 130/20 134/5 140/11 143/17 143/18 143/25 146/6 147/8

meals [3] 53/19 84/12 88/10 mean [14] 27/22 51/16 73/19 86/24 87/14 89/21 99/21 101/23 106/25 107/3 113/7 120/16 142/19 142/20

meaning [9] 27/8 28/21 39/20 46/8 61/1 62/24 63/5 63/23

means [19] 30/14 39/2 43/25 46/17 52/10 57/6 75/3 75/12 80/9 80/23 86/24 87/9 91/23 120/17 124/19 137/19 146/16 148/9 152/10

measure [1] 116/9 measured [1] 115/17 measures [1] 143/4 meat [2] 52/17 53/17 meats [1] 137/23 mechanics [1] 57/25 mechanizes [1] 43/10 median [1] 107/3 meet [18] 12/8 13/4 15/9 17/11 35/21 35/23 36/1 36/7 49/10 57/18 59/2 61/8 61/14 61/16 62/11 65/24 69/9 82/3 meets [1] 122/10 member [2] 68/17 88/7

mention [3] 21/14 30/24 136/23

mentioned [4] 46/7 59/7 97/25

members [1] 38/8

133/12

membership [1] 55/9

М

mentions [1] 136/22 merchandising [1] 87/16 merge [2] 62/3 139/17 merged [2] 113/16 113/17 merger [106] merger's [1] 69/7 merger-specific [2] 62/20 63/6 mergers [3] 116/15 148/20 150/16 merging [1] 39/21 merits [9] 35/17 35/22 35/25 69/11 79/1 79/7 79/8 82/6 100/9 message [1] 65/13 messages [1] 48/10 met [4] 18/18 26/13 26/22 62/24 methodology [1] 57/3 metrics [1] 120/10 **MEXICO [5]** 3/12 3/13 8/19 35/4 37/15 Meyer [11] 34/4 42/20 42/22 47/15 50/11 70/22 86/12 109/19 109/21 109/25 109/25 **Meyer's [2]** 36/19 48/17 Michael [1] 5/7 middle [3] 30/23 44/20 99/10 Midwest [2] 91/4 91/6 might [16] 22/21 24/15 24/19 24/20 51/14 82/14 91/16 91/17 130/7 131/2 131/5 131/10 134/6 137/19 140/12 140/20 Mike [2] 10/3 62/4 mile [10] 107/2 107/19 107/20 108/25 109/19 109/21 110/2 110/6 110/7 110/10 milk [4] 104/17 107/7 107/18 137/23 million [8] 65/17 100/5 103/3 104/12 104/15 113/18 113/22 123/9 millions [4] 45/15 45/18 80/8 123/9 mind [1] 13/9 minimized [1] 83/20 minor [3] 78/16 95/11 95/13 minors [2] 78/19 95/10 minute [2] 82/18 140/11 minutes [5] 90/13 94/16 101/4 102/4 123/23 mirror [1] 91/5 misapprehension [1] 83/23 misspoke [1] 84/24

mistake [2] 99/16 108/18 mistakes [1] 149/18 misunderstanding [1] 83/24 mitigate [1] 150/3 mitigates [1] 69/6 model [10] 67/11 76/12 112/13 112/13 112/18 116/20 116/22 117/18 118/4 118/20 modeling [1] 112/12 models [2] 115/23 128/20 **mole [1]** 103/2 mom [1] 92/25 moment [2] 23/7 25/9 moments [3] 97/8 132/11 132/11 money [4] 64/6 64/12 92/2 138/6 monitoring [1] 136/19 monomaniacal [1] 112/4 monomaniacally [2] 111/7 114/22 monopolies [1] 81/12 monopolist [10] 51/25 56/21 56/22 57/2 108/10 108/11 108/16 108/20 109/13 109/13 monopoly [2] 62/1 62/1 month [1] 79/13 months [10] 26/5 31/19 67/5 79/15 96/1 99/18 104/24 105/13 131/24 149/1 more [82] Moreover [2] 73/25 80/7 **Moriarty [2]** 5/8 10/9 morning [37] 1/15 7/5 8/1 8/7 8/9 8/15 8/16 8/17 8/20 8/22 8/24 9/1 9/3 9/5 9/6 9/8 9/17 9/18 9/20 9/21 9/23 9/24 10/4 10/10 10/11 11/9 13/19 13/20 22/25 23/1 30/25 32/16 85/7 85/19 123/20 123/21 151/8 Morris [12] 10/14 47/7 52/10 94/15 94/21 148/13 148/16 148/17 148/24 149/4 149/21 150/1 Morrison [2] 3/17 5/3 mortar [3] 58/24 59/6 89/18 most [21] 12/25 13/5 14/24 15/20 18/4 31/6 42/13 63/21 78/15 80/17 83/9 86/13 87/5

103/24 105/14 121/3 124/13

mostly [1] 11/11

129/20 140/18 145/25 150/14

motion [2] 17/22 18/19 motions [1] 13/11 motivation [1] 93/8 **motivations** [1] 93/18 move [5] 95/18 97/13 110/18 116/2 132/12 moving [1] 16/5 Mr [39] 2/4 2/7 2/8 3/1 3/2 3/5 3/9 3/12 3/16 3/19 3/23 4/1 4/4 4/9 4/10 4/10 4/13 5/2 5/5 5/6 5/7 5/7 5/8 6/4 14/8 16/11 28/5 30/22 30/24 32/21 63/17 68/17 87/1 93/18 94/6 111/2 111/3 135/23 144/11 **Mr. [33]** 10/13 11/5 14/7 17/3 28/1 28/8 28/18 29/8 29/24 30/17 31/2 31/10 31/12 48/7 48/24 63/18 64/1 64/16 65/16 68/15 73/3 78/7 87/1 124/5 125/4 127/9 129/6 138/14 140/13 142/15 143/6 143/22 146/24 Mr. Anderson [3] 11/5 14/7 17/3 Mr. Broderick [2] 48/7 48/24 Mr. Galante [4] 28/1 30/17 31/2 31/10 Mr. McMullen [1] 87/1 Mr. McPherson [1] 78/7 Mr. Perry [1] 29/24 Mr. Sankaran [3] 142/15 143/6 146/24 Mr. Shores [1] 65/16 Mr. Vivek Sankaran [1] 10/13 Mr. Winn [3] 28/8 68/15 73/3 Mr. Winn's [2] 28/18 29/8 Mr. Wolf [8] 31/12 124/5 125/4 127/9 129/6 138/14 140/13 143/22 Mr. Yeater [3] 63/18 64/1 64/16 Ms [18] 2/3 2/7 2/12 2/16 2/20 4/6 4/9 4/16 5/5 5/6 5/8 6/3 6/5 22/24 66/1 94/21 136/3 149/25 **Ms. [34]** 10/14 11/5 24/7 25/25 26/3 26/17 27/8 27/15 28/12 28/17 29/10 29/21 31/4 31/16 33/15 52/10 68/11 70/14 78/5 81/2 90/13 94/15 115/1 119/3 122/23 137/14 137/16 137/23 148/16 148/17 148/24 149/4 149/21 150/1 Ms. Florenz [7] 26/3 26/17 28/12 28/17 29/21 31/16 68/11

Ms. Florenz's [3] 27/8 27/15 29/10

Ms. Hall [3] 11/5 24/7 33/15

Ms. Hesse [2] 25/25 31/4

Ms. Kinney [1] 137/16

Ms. Kinney's [1] 137/23

Ms. Mainigi [5] 90/13 94/15 115/1 119/3 122/23

Ms. Morris [7] 52/10 148/16 148/17 148/24 149/4 149/21 150/1

Ms. Musser [3] 70/14 78/5 137/14

Ms. Oligario [1] 81/2 Ms. Susan [1] 10/14 much [16] 31/9 42/17 54/9 54/20 58/18 89/4 90/10 90/10 101/25 116/2 116/20 122/4 126/10 136/1 140/9 151/2 multi [1] 145/6 multi-decade [1] 145/6 multibillion [2] 34/23 35/11 multibillion-dollar [2] 34/23 35/11

multipack [1] 53/15 multiple [4] 40/10 69/14 124/21 148/20

multiply [1] 116/1 Musser [7] 2/3 6/3 8/2 33/14 70/14 78/5 137/14 must [12] 29/8 49/19 49/24 51/10 62/18 62/19 63/8 65/5 73/9 84/18 103/23 141/11

mutual [1] 78/7

my [36] 7/12 7/23 8/3 11/10 14/5 15/13 16/11 18/14 21/18 22/20 25/7 31/23 32/2 32/17 32/20 33/13 33/15 39/13 62/15 65/19 66/1 82/15 90/13 103/18 105/12 106/21 111/8 119/3 123/22 123/25 127/15 129/3 141/7 143/17 145/8 150/6 myriad [1] 53/3

Ν

N.W [3] 2/9 2/22 4/11 name [7] 19/1 33/13 73/20 99/24 123/22 139/21 150/3 Namely [1] 50/1 names [5] 132/25 133/17 134/17 134/18 147/15

Naomi [1] 80/24 Naomi Oligario [1] 80/24 narrow [4] 11/7 43/4 109/11 111/14

narrowed [1] 18/21 narrower [3] 103/10 107/21 107/23

national [15] 49/16 53/8 54/23 55/6 93/11 96/22 133/15 135/9 139/15 140/10 140/12 140/15 141/5 141/6 146/14

nationally [2] 93/1 141/4 nationwide [5] 89/25 90/25 92/21 92/21 146/16

natural [4] 50/16 54/14 54/15 58/10

nature [3] 11/24 13/23 147/21 **NE [1]** 3/20

near [2] 75/20 149/13 nearby [2] 77/12 116/1

nearly [7] 77/18 77/19 79/9 85/9 103/21 103/23 140/21

necessarily [1] 126/1

necessary [5] 21/17 21/21 23/18 71/18 73/1

necessity [1] 16/22 need [22] 26/10 26/12 32/9 35/21 35/24 38/13 38/18 58/3 64/18 66/14 73/18 74/18 87/4 88/10 92/15 100/3 103/4 106/22

117/1 127/16 131/3 142/18 needed [3] 63/13 75/23 139/6

neediest [1] 84/13 needs [4] 14/1 74/21 94/11

127/18 nefarious [1] 93/17 **negative [1]** 119/23

negotiate [1] 60/16

negotiated [1] 30/8 negotiating [1] 59/17

negotiation [1] 60/18 negotiations [1] 78/15

neighborhood [3] 130/23 131/10 137/12

neighbors [1] 145/19

neither [2] 84/22 146/13 **NELSON [1]** 1/17

neoclassical [4] 112/23 113/1 115/11 115/13

network [3] 92/21 140/23 146/15

networks [1] 96/16

neutral [1] 100/12 **NEVADA [4]** 3/9 3/10 8/23 35/4 never [9] 61/25 72/10 78/8 99/19 99/20 99/21 99/21 118/8

121/24

new [29] 3/12 3/13 4/8 8/18 18/3 18/7 26/3 35/4 37/15 43/9 49/2 49/4 68/8 75/17 76/7 94/12 95/15 96/9 97/13 97/16 98/25 104/10 112/17 112/17 117/11 134/17 134/18 135/3 135/7

news [1] 11/11 next [30] 16/19 22/8 41/24 45/1 46/4 47/4 48/12 54/14 57/9 58/14 74/8 79/15 86/18 87/15 88/19 89/7 90/6 91/3 99/7 99/18 103/25 118/24 119/25 125/11 127/2 135/2 141/17 141/19 142/6 147/5

Ngan [1] 4/6 **nice [3]** 107/24 145/15 145/15 **Nicholas** [1] 56/8 Nicholas Hill [1] 56/8 Nicole [2] 2/16 9/2 Nicole Gordon [1] 9/2 night [1] 106/10

Ninth [3] 4/2 27/10 27/11 **NM [1]** 3/15

no [60] 1/4 12/3 14/18 17/18 18/11 18/16 25/12 27/20 29/16 31/16 46/13 46/14 51/16 62/2 62/6 63/25 66/9 67/1 69/7 70/17 80/18 84/10 84/10 89/18 89/23 97/2 97/3 98/16 99/15 101/5 101/10 101/21 102/1 106/2 109/9 110/15 110/20 114/2 114/15 114/16 118/25 119/1 120/5 120/7 120/13 120/22 121/9 121/16 122/13 122/13 122/15 122/18 122/21 123/3 123/4 132/21 139/18 141/9

No. [1] 7/8

144/24 152/17

No. 3:24-cv-00347 [1] 7/8 **nobody [1]** 127/3

non [5] 41/4 41/5 47/2 48/20 63/5

non-anticompetitive [1] 63/5 non-price [3] 41/4 41/5 48/20 non-pricing [1] 47/2 none [11] 76/9 97/5 97/11 106/3 119/18 119/21 119/24 120/4

N

none... [3] 122/18 122/18 133/25 nonexistent [1] 97/8 nontraditional [1] 133/18 nonunion [1] 123/2 Nope [3] 106/1 106/1 106/2 Nord [2] 3/19 8/13 **norm** [1] 107/3 **Northeast [1]** 91/2 **Northern [1]** 91/3 Northwest [2] 93/10 98/11 not [160] note [1] 44/8 **noted** [1] 13/24 notes [2] 74/19 105/11 **nothing [8]** 16/7 25/16 32/11 32/12 32/13 91/3 97/11 100/25 **Notice [1]** 92/21 noticed [1] 140/21 notified [1] 30/2 **notifying [1]** 68/13 notwithstanding [1] 87/18 now [92] nowhere [1] 149/13 number [20] 7/12 11/3 18/21 26/18 33/9 38/10 39/8 44/10 66/4 73/14 77/8 77/14 115/17 118/6 130/18 132/4 134/12 136/16 146/10 149/18 numbers [1] 13/1 **numerator** [1] 116/6 numerous [1] 74/4 **NV [1]** 3/11 **NW [1]** 4/14 **NY [1]** 4/8

0

oath [1] 28/13
Obaro [4] 4/4 9/19 13/21 14/8
object [1] 31/18
objection [4] 18/11 25/12 27/20
31/16
observation [2] 28/1 54/6
obsession [1] 112/4
obtain [1] 59/18
obvious [1] 91/16
obviously [5] 124/9 127/8
143/20 144/9 144/15
occur [3] 81/14 81/22 100/7
occurred [2] 66/24 85/12
occurring [2] 37/22 50/14

occurs [1] 96/17 October [2] 35/22 132/13 off [3] 11/22 42/6 144/5 offer [14] 50/19 50/21 52/21 53/7 53/17 53/24 54/18 54/20 55/1 55/20 57/20 130/3 131/17 134/11 offered [1] 134/3 offering [2] 41/15 48/6 offers [2] 52/22 56/5 Office [7] 2/13 2/17 2/21 3/2 3/6 3/10 3/13 officer [5] 9/15 87/17 94/17 135/19 148/14 Official [1] 152/16 offset [7] 57/7 58/4 59/4 62/21 63/8 69/19 139/11 often [5] 45/24 47/25 55/11 133/1 138/1 **OH [5]** 4/18 18/16 21/25 22/23 26/12 okay [10] 12/18 14/14 15/7 18/16 20/12 24/10 26/17 32/22 101/24 142/7 old [3] 85/21 98/21 112/15 **Oleksii [1]** 106/10 Oleksii Khvastunov [1] 106/10 **Oligario [2]** 80/24 81/2 once [7] 57/9 60/9 61/14 62/24 99/21 103/6 130/23 one [99] one-hundredths [2] 114/10 114/13 one-page [1] 19/15 one-stop [14] 50/21 52/6 52/8 52/12 52/19 52/20 53/25 103/22 129/4 130/2 130/8 130/16 130/22 131/25 one-way [1] 114/24 ones [2] 118/16 118/16 online [2] 105/1 131/13 only [29] 27/18 31/18 35/24 61/4 62/24 63/6 63/19 63/19 64/11 73/20 74/2 74/8 76/15 77/25 78/13 82/6 84/8 85/16 91/22 98/5 103/25 110/24 125/8 130/8 130/11 132/8 134/23 140/9 144/23 open [6] 7/3 33/8 33/8 68/20 135/3 147/21 opening [21] 6/2 6/3 6/4 6/5 16/2 21/15 21/18 26/8 32/15

32/18 33/8 33/12 33/14 82/23 83/4 83/22 93/15 95/10 100/25 117/21 123/19 openings [1] 22/7 openly [1] 12/20 operate [7] 36/17 37/8 72/11 72/23 74/18 75/24 146/4 operated [2] 72/10 77/1 operates [5] 36/18 36/20 37/2 37/5 37/6 operating [4] 19/3 77/5 94/17 148/14 operation [2] 17/5 70/7 operations [6] 36/12 72/22 73/7 74/11 74/17 75/13 operators [1] 72/7 opinion [1] 57/20 opportunities [2] 96/22 97/19 opportunity [6] 74/24 79/5 91/10 94/20 138/16 145/6 opposed [1] 24/24 opposite [1] 144/21 **opposition** [1] 145/4 option [3] 55/4 140/4 150/21 options [10] 21/7 38/4 39/19 41/17 53/3 53/5 55/2 140/1 142/20 144/9 ord.uscourts.gov [1] 5/21 order [13] 7/15 11/18 33/3 37/22 43/24 45/20 48/18 48/19 49/2 64/25 82/10 87/9 131/13 ordered [1] 80/5 ordinary [14] 40/24 45/1 51/19 52/7 54/12 55/23 56/13 56/25 59/25 60/17 60/20 64/6 67/22 67/24 **OREGON [18]** 1/2 1/8 3/16 3/19 8/13 8/14 35/4 37/25 38/5 38/11 38/13 39/10 46/25 70/21 74/2 109/19 110/7 152/17 **Oregonians** [1] 38/11 organic [2] 54/16 54/16 **Organics [2]** 53/11 147/22 organization [2] 67/10 68/9 original [1] 152/11 originally [1] 12/22 originating [1] 20/18 Osco [1] 80/18 other [52] 12/6 20/8 23/22 26/2 27/25 29/9 32/6 32/9 34/18 42/9 42/16 43/18 45/22 53/18 54/3 54/12 55/15 56/14 56/16 61/18

other... [32] 66/5 70/18 75/2 77/11 80/19 87/17 91/5 94/22 99/3 99/23 104/2 106/16 110/16 112/14 114/2 116/18 116/24 120/18 121/4 128/3 133/12 133/17 134/17 136/6 136/13 138/10 139/12 141/5 142/5 144/9 145/8 146/18 others [8] 69/20 72/7 88/18 88/23 126/17 133/13 136/23 139/9

otherwise [4] 13/7 78/11 88/8 100/4

our [84]

out [30] 22/17 23/9 23/15 24/14 24/15 25/11 31/12 37/19 38/9 38/25 39/10 39/19 39/23 47/5 47/11 47/12 48/7 51/22 61/2 66/20 75/23 90/20 115/12 126/9 132/2 135/9 136/4 138/6 138/22 140/4

outcome [2] 72/12 150/14 outright [1] 98/2 outside [9] 57/7 84/18 107/9 107/12 107/20 109/1 109/6 109/21 121/6

outstanding [1] 14/10 outstripped [1] 89/14 outweighed [1] 81/17 over [50] 11/1 12/13 12/15 24/3 25/11 26/9 31/15 32/21 33/17 33/24 34/15 36/4 37/1 37/2 37/4 37/8 37/12 38/8 39/24 43/6 57/5 59/11 62/5 66/1 76/6 79/12 80/20 85/13 87/19 88/14 94/18 98/1 99/6 99/17 110/4 114/20 114/20 114/21 118/24 119/3 122/23 128/5 128/6 128/8 132/1 132/3 134/12 135/2 139/13

145/10
over-inclusive [1] 110/4
overall [3] 34/10 65/20 65/21
overcome [1] 73/9
overlap [8] 38/2 43/1 43/2 43/14
81/25 94/10 117/7 124/5
overlapping [1] 97/1
overlaps [1] 92/14
oversees [1] 149/4
overwhelming [1] 130/18
own [25] 19/23 19/25 35/7
38/25 39/19 41/14 52/14 52/17

59/23 62/7 76/12 82/15 93/4 97/1 97/23 98/1 107/14 112/14 118/3 118/19 118/19 118/20 125/10 136/4 144/8

owned [4] 38/5 77/1 77/12 83/13

owners [2] 93/6 112/17 ownership [3] 73/17 147/11 147/19

owns [4] 37/1 37/5 38/23 59/7

P

p.m [1] 27/7 pace [1] 89/4 Pacific [2] 93/10 98/11 package [6] 53/13 66/16 67/23 71/12 77/2 82/2

Paez [2] 2/20 8/25 page [7] 6/2 19/15 19/18 19/19

27/4 27/4 27/16 page 8 [1] 19/19

pages [2] 19/13 27/15

Pai [2] 2/7 8/9

paid [1] 120/14 Palmer [1] 68/18

paper [3] 116/19 137/21 137/25 parity [4] 43/25 44/1 44/15

44/21

Parkway [1] 4/5

part [17] 15/1 29/14 35/9 66/12 82/1 83/18 90/24 92/16 99/24 105/22 106/14 111/19 126/14 133/14 135/6 145/25 147/6 particular [24] 20/10 20/14 20/14 20/21 20/21 20/24 21/11 21/11 23/24 24/19 25/11 27/4 30/11 45/4 47/5 48/23 49/22 52/24 56/17 60/6 64/22 120/13 134/21 139/13

particularly [3] 23/25 72/13 74/25

parties [21] 11/13 11/16 12/2 12/5 12/17 15/9 29/22 29/24 42/24 78/18 78/18 79/21 80/3 80/4 80/7 81/15 81/25 84/23 94/10 103/14 103/14

parties' [1] 81/6 partner [1] 85/21 partners [1] 88/2 partnerships [1] 140/3 parts [1] 16/5 party [1] 103/14 pass [5] 62/20 80/21 91/11 91/19 92/2 passage [1] 29/11 passed [1] 57/5

past [6] 16/7 16/8 61/17 67/23 129/5 133/6

path [3] 12/16 14/24 113/17 Paul [4] 3/2 3/6 106/9 106/9 pause [6] 13/16 35/19 60/24 65/12 69/11 134/5

pay [1] 55/9

paying [3] 33/19 33/20 81/19 pending [3] 69/11 79/2 82/9

pennies [1] 64/8

Pennsylvania [1] 2/9

people [27] 7/12 22/18 22/22 24/14 32/7 50/24 52/14 80/8 89/5 94/14 99/25 104/12 104/15 110/1 126/14 130/8 130/23 131/2 134/8 139/16 146/2 146/2 148/6 148/9 148/10 149/16

149/21 **Pepsi [2]** 53/8 91/17

per [2] 33/4 80/22 percent [57] 38/23 39/1 39/15 39/15 39/18 42/25 43/3 56/16 56/18 58/4 64/10 70/25 71/1 71/1 76/21 76/23 77/15 77/18 77/19 85/2 85/3 87/25 89/3 101/22 103/22 103/23 104/1 108/15 108/17 109/8 113/9 113/18 113/22 114/6 114/9 114/10 114/11 114/13 115/18 117/25 120/11 120/12 120/12 120/14 121/5 121/7 121/15 124/16 132/5 133/21 135/13 135/14 136/8 136/9 136/12 136/13 136/14

percentage [3] 63/20 85/9 103/19

perception [4] 19/7 20/1 23/12 24/12

perceptions [3] 19/5 19/20 19/24

perfect [3] 70/5 70/11 71/3
perform [1] 75/19
performance [5] 66/19 67/2
67/11 67/15 76/18

performing [2] 66/16 93/20 perhaps [2] 22/20 82/15 period [4] 28/24 29/5 29/7 29/13

permits [1] 82/6

perpetual [1] 147/12 Perry [5] 4/13 9/16 22/4 29/24 30/1 personal [2] 26/21 28/9 personalization [1] 87/3 personalized [1] 55/4 **personnel** [1] 66/14 perspective [4] 90/14 124/6 144/16 145/24 persuasion [1] 101/14 **Pfaffenroth [2]** 4/9 9/10 pharmacies [3] 37/2 37/5 37/9 **pharmacy** [1] 100/4 phenomenon [4] 131/14 131/16 131/24 137/18 Philadelphia [1] 49/16 phone [1] 47/24 picked [2] 103/1 136/19 picking [2] 23/12 103/7 **pickup [1]** 41/16 picture [1] 37/25 piece [2] 24/16 86/25 **pillars [2]** 40/7 40/14 **pillow [1]** 116/7 pinpoint [1] 132/10 Pitt [2] 5/5 10/2 **Pizza [1]** 54/23 place [5] 3/6 22/8 35/11 100/7 112/3 places [5] 23/22 50/25 99/13 140/7 140/8 plain [1] 95/12 plainly [1] 108/4 **Plains [1]** 91/7 plaintiff [13] 2/3 2/12 2/16 2/20 3/1 3/5 3/9 3/12 3/16 3/23 8/18 35/2 62/24 plaintiffs [63] 1/4 11/5 12/20 17/25 28/15 33/1 33/15 35/14 35/18 35/23 36/1 39/25 40/2 40/8 40/12 41/1 44/4 49/10 49/12 49/24 50/6 50/13 50/25 51/17 51/19 51/24 52/3 55/14 55/22 58/19 59/11 59/13 59/19 59/22 60/19 61/4 61/6 61/8 61/14 62/8 63/2 63/17 69/25 71/7 71/11 84/17 84/18 85/4 85/6 85/11 85/20 85/25 86/10 100/20 102/7 127/14 129/13 129/23 130/12 144/16 144/24 146/3 150/18

plaintiffs' [17] 26/4 27/1 39/13 40/7 50/17 50/24 51/6 56/7 59/10 62/10 73/6 78/25 86/19 96/25 101/5 117/21 134/3 plan [10] 14/2 18/2 21/10 24/17 24/22 74/3 74/22 80/13 80/14 141/14 **planned [1]** 16/15 planning [3] 20/21 48/22 149/1 plans [12] 20/9 20/13 23/19 23/24 32/7 48/14 68/16 73/25 75/8 80/22 125/4 148/1 plants [1] 37/10 players [5] 86/2 135/5 135/10 140/19 141/5 playing [1] 103/2 plays [1] 39/10 pleadings [1] 103/11 pleasant [1] 83/8 please [5] 7/5 11/6 46/4 58/14 83/1 pleased [2] 11/16 85/4 pleasure [1] 145/16 Pleat [1] 82/22 pledged [2] 144/3 144/7 **plummeted** [1] 132/18 **plus [1]** 135/11 **PM [1]** 151/8 **Podoll [4]** 5/6 10/1 14/5 16/11 point [24] 14/22 16/14 17/2 17/13 18/2 22/5 23/4 25/22 32/3 40/14 64/2 124/9 124/13 126/25 129/3 131/9 138/8 138/11 140/13 141/7 141/10 145/8 145/8 150/6 points [13] 16/10 68/13 85/9 103/21 124/1 124/4 124/6 132/2 143/18 144/11 146/5 146/6 146/8 poised [1] 90/10 polishing [1] 49/4 **poor [2]** 67/2 67/15 **poorly [1]** 66/15 pop [1] 92/25 Porter [3] 4/11 9/9 9/10 portion [1] 24/8 **Portland [12]** 1/8 3/18 4/3 5/3 5/20 34/4 36/18 38/16 42/19 56/5 69/17 109/18 poses [2] 68/7 110/15

position [6] 15/19 19/6 28/8

30/14 30/15 124/17

positive [1] 147/16 possess [1] 7/19 possible [5] 11/25 42/17 42/21 84/8 143/14 post [11] 46/20 57/17 57/24 66/19 69/22 70/24 70/24 70/25 72/9 76/18 119/10 post-divestiture [5] 66/19 70/24 70/25 72/9 76/18 post-merger [4] 46/20 57/17 57/24 70/24 post-transaction [1] 69/22 post-trial [1] 119/10 potential [3] 20/19 29/25 57/8 potentially [2] 23/21 90/19 power [3] 39/3 39/20 146/25 practical [2] 51/21 55/17 practically [1] 38/17 practice [1] 51/4 **practiced [1]** 106/10 practices [1] 29/18 pragmatic [1] 50/1 **pre [1]** 39/14 pre-merger [1] 39/14 **precise [1]** 57/3 **predecessor** [1] 68/17 predict [3] 48/18 76/3 76/12 **predicted** [1] 71/1 prediction [1] 22/20 **predicts** [1] 75/25 prefer [1] 56/2 **preferred** [1] 105/3 **prehearing [1]** 12/25 prejudiced [1] 28/7 preliminary [13] 1/14 7/9 69/21 82/5 92/16 95/19 95/24 96/3 97/9 99/8 102/21 102/22 152/5 prelude [1] 150/11 premium [2] 54/16 54/16 preparation [1] 19/3 prepare [1] 26/22 prepares [1] 18/6 preparing [1] 27/19 presence [6] 43/3 89/18 91/2 91/6 91/7 134/7 present [14] 13/4 15/25 41/1 44/4 51/24 52/3 55/23 59/11 60/20 63/17 71/12 74/2 82/6 86/1 presentation [1] 56/4 presented [3] 69/10 97/20 140/4

presenting [3] 33/14 61/4 61/6 presents [1] 145/5 preserve [1] 150/19 President [2] 48/2 111/18 presidents [2] 46/23 47/1 press [5] 21/8 68/18 104/23 105/12 128/13 pressure [7] 46/9 46/15 88/22 104/16 107/6 107/16 109/24 pressures [1] 109/15 **presumption** [1] 100/22 presumptive [2] 77/8 77/18 presumptively [6] 49/13 57/15 70/11 70/16 70/20 70/23 pretrial [4] 7/23 7/25 32/9 95/21 pretty [3] 22/16 75/3 100/18 prevent [2] 35/20 45/11 **preview [2]** 36/13 124/2 previously [5] 58/7 59/7 64/21 77/1 148/22 price [77] priced [3] 44/2 45/9 45/21 prices [91] pricing [40] 41/25 42/4 42/4 42/10 42/11 42/20 43/13 43/17 43/21 43/24 43/25 44/1 44/14 44/15 44/17 44/18 44/21 45/7 45/15 46/9 47/2 47/2 47/22 65/16 65/18 74/11 75/2 84/25 85/1 88/24 92/10 109/14 111/5 111/23 111/24 112/13 114/13 115/9 115/10 136/20 prima [6] 36/8 39/25 49/10 59/12 61/14 62/10 primarily [3] 67/16 120/18 129/19 primary [9] 42/13 42/15 42/19 43/1 43/11 43/17 50/23 51/8 135/12 principal [2] 86/21 86/21 **principle [1]** 86/15 printed [1] 47/23 printer [1] 32/2 **prior [9]** 26/22 27/23 28/13 66/12 66/20 72/11 76/14 121/2 121/3 private [16] 41/13 53/9 53/10 74/12 76/8 79/17 87/7 93/3 93/4 93/25 95/2 96/22 97/25 98/3 98/19 147/20 **pro [1]** 100/12

pro-competitive [1] 100/12 probabilistic [1] 81/10 probability [2] 56/11 61/10 probably [1] 111/4 probative [1] 72/12 problem [3] 68/20 106/5 108/5 problematic [3] 117/23 118/7 118/10 problems [1] 36/10 procedure [2] 18/11 27/13 proceed [1] 16/24 proceeding [11] 35/16 35/18 35/22 35/23 38/15 69/12 79/2 79/3 79/8 92/16 99/14 proceedings [5] 1/16 7/1 80/6 81/2 152/10 proceeds [2] 46/21 81/14 process [5] 13/3 43/10 99/18 99/24 133/9 procure [1] 100/3 produce [8] 41/12 51/17 59/13 61/15 69/1 92/9 93/23 134/11 produced [4] 48/9 56/12 58/25 74/22 producing [2] 36/3 36/5 product [35] 36/4 49/24 50/7 50/15 50/18 53/4 53/7 55/21 56/23 58/22 69/23 70/9 72/4 72/4 73/21 77/21 78/22 78/23 98/24 100/21 100/23 101/13 102/7 102/20 106/24 107/9 108/1 108/8 108/19 110/13 118/22 125/20 145/16 146/18 147/2 production [4] 71/9 101/14 101/17 102/1 productive [2] 12/13 18/20 products [22] 41/9 41/13 42/20 44/14 44/15 48/7 50/3 51/22 52/21 52/22 52/23 53/1 74/12 76/9 80/1 80/14 92/9 93/25 98/20 105/5 117/13 126/6 profit [5] 75/13 112/24 113/8 117/17 133/22 profitability [1] 76/13 profound [2] 83/25 100/18 program [10] 43/9 43/9 43/10 43/17 75/1 97/17 111/24 111/25 111/25 111/25 programs [2] 75/3 93/25 progress [2] 47/9 128/17

project [2] 25/1 88/9

projections [1] 68/3 projects [2] 70/8 76/6 **prominent [1]** 105/15 promise [3] 64/3 64/5 64/17 promises [3] 64/18 65/6 65/8 **promo [1]** 48/3 **Promos** [1] 47/25 promotion [2] 34/9 75/2 promotional [4] 42/5 47/22 75/5 75/8 promotions [4] 41/15 42/6 47/22 48/6 **proof [3]** 67/21 78/25 101/15 proper [4] 101/13 101/13 105/24 118/12 properly [3] 50/25 100/20 102/7 **property** [1] 73/11 proposal [3] 14/15 15/11 17/7 **proposed [11]** 7/10 56/9 61/19 62/15 66/4 66/10 68/23 69/6 71/8 77/22 81/21 proprietary [1] 20/2 prospect [2] 76/21 112/12 protect [4] 12/19 14/20 79/25 144/22 protected [1] 95/8 protection [3] 3/14 33/3 123/5 proud [2] 88/2 88/4 **prove [4]** 101/17 110/7 110/17 130/13 provide [21] 11/6 33/21 41/8 41/12 41/16 52/20 53/13 54/3 55/11 56/8 56/20 57/12 57/13 62/9 63/1 63/15 74/15 78/12 88/11 99/1 125/9 provided [2] 19/11 88/10 provides [1] 103/15 providing [5] 18/20 41/13 41/17 53/3 93/23 **proving [1]** 129/13 provision [9] 26/21 26/25 27/9 28/2 28/4 29/2 30/4 30/11 30/14 provisions [2] 27/1 27/21 Psyche [1] 104/11 public [20] 20/1 23/7 23/12 23/23 33/5 33/8 38/6 38/9 79/19 80/9 80/23 81/5 96/5 96/5 97/10 99/6 113/11 126/23 141/12 141/13 publicly [1] 84/19 **Publix [1]** 140/17 punish [1] 104/18

raise [20] 16/4 20/4 35/24 36/1

radius [1] 108/25

P

purchase [9] 26/20 27/2 28/2 30/9 34/7 34/22 51/5 75/11 75/14 purchases [2] 55/11 83/10 purple [1] 101/19 purported [5] 62/12 63/18 63/21 93/16 121/7 purports [1] 31/18 purpose [4] 49/25 79/18 81/11 130/4 purposes [1] 115/21 pursuant [1] 18/17 push [4] 32/6 35/19 64/13 128/12 **pushed [1]** 112/17 pushing [2] 65/12 87/21 put [18] 25/21 34/1 36/11 40/2 59/23 64/5 86/10 88/22 91/8 91/18 98/20 98/21 98/22 104/16 107/16 109/14 111/10 120/6 puts [2] 109/24 146/19 putting [4] 33/19 46/9 49/4 107/6 **PX [1]** 44/9 **PX3406 [1]** 19/18

Q

QFC [3] 36/19 44/20 74/1 qualified [1] 148/20 quality [7] 33/21 35/13 40/17 50/5 67/25 88/24 105/5 quarter [4] 45/19 103/24 103/25 107/19 question [20] 23/23 23/25 24/4 27/5 27/16 28/23 50/1 59/20 61/9 62/25 74/24 79/1 100/10 100/20 106/23 109/5 110/18 130/1 137/17 139/17 **questioned** [1] 30/16 questions [4] 25/19 35/24 36/2 86/20 quick [1] 151/6 quickly [8] 15/17 55/21 81/16 100/2 101/2 101/3 108/6 128/9 quite [2] 22/21 59/1 quivering [1] 48/11 quo [2] 150/19 150/21 quote [6] 45/9 49/18 60/22 66/13 66/24 72/23 quoting [1] 29/14

R

46/19 58/4 59/19 61/19 104/17 105/4 107/6 108/15 115/24 127/5 128/1 128/2 128/2 128/4 128/6 128/22 raised [4] 31/3 57/1 62/25 93/9 raises [3] 107/18 115/25 127/10 raising [3] 16/7 104/18 129/1 Raley's [2] 50/10 53/23 **Ralphs [1]** 47/16 ramping [2] 83/16 96/10 ran [1] 149/20 range [8] 45/5 45/6 52/22 52/23 53/13 53/17 55/1 74/16 ranging [1] 37/14 rapid [1] 89/4 rather [7] 22/5 32/5 35/18 91/25 108/6 118/9 121/20 ratio [1] 115/24 ratios [1] 116/14 **Ray's [2]** 98/11 98/17 **RDR [2]** 5/19 152/15 reach [1] 89/8 reached [6] 11/17 12/6 14/8 18/22 60/9 90/20 reactive [1] 96/19 read [3] 95/20 95/21 130/5 **readily [1]** 137/2 reading [2] 47/11 47/12 ready [2] 148/1 149/2 real [17] 56/25 75/13 103/13 108/21 109/3 109/14 109/18 113/25 114/12 114/14 114/16 114/17 115/12 117/16 122/11 125/16 128/17 realities [4] 127/17 127/19 127/25 127/25 reality [9] 14/21 85/2 103/23 131/1 132/7 135/19 138/4 144/21 150/13 realization [1] 64/15 realize [2] 18/7 131/11 realized [1] 141/24 really [11] 17/1 17/3 28/14 92/22 100/11 100/17 110/25 111/1 117/17 124/6 132/12 reaping [1] 34/11 reason [19] 13/10 62/21 63/12 100/18 101/3 103/13 108/5 110/22 114/24 117/1 118/8

119/1 125/11 127/7 127/7 129/10 131/20 144/17 150/23 reasonable [4] 56/10 57/7 61/10 102/18 reasonably [1] 130/3 reasons [6] 66/4 71/25 74/8 124/21 125/25 127/10 rebanner [3] 20/9 20/13 73/18 rebannering [16] 18/25 20/9 23/4 23/6 24/20 67/12 73/16 73/19 73/22 75/6 76/6 76/7 149/19 150/1 150/1 150/2 rebut [2] 36/8 62/10 rebuttal [3] 14/11 18/5 71/9 rebutting [1] 62/14 receive [1] 17/21 received [5] 7/14 12/15 19/7 26/3 27/6 receiving [2] 11/20 34/12 recent [1] 129/23 recently [5] 51/14 72/17 105/19 131/23 134/25 recess [2] 82/20 151/4 reciprocated [1] 114/23 recognize [4] 30/21 85/12 92/12 142/23 recognized [2] 40/20 92/12 recommend [1] 13/13 recommendations [1] 43/12 record [8] 7/22 11/14 14/23 71/22 82/7 82/10 128/7 152/9 **recoup [1]** 75/18 recover [1] 75/12 recreate [1] 63/3 red [2] 38/22 54/23 redacted [2] 33/5 44/8 redactions [1] 18/21 reduce [5] 42/17 45/20 64/25 120/2 143/11 reducing [7] 46/10 59/21 61/11 88/12 88/13 142/12 142/13 reduction [2] 57/23 77/15 reductions [8] 83/11 83/14 125/7 125/8 125/10 132/14 143/12 143/21 redundancies [1] 91/21 **Redwood [2]** 4/5 4/5 refer [3] 95/10 129/7 131/15 reference [1] 149/25 referred [5] 19/13 44/2 54/25 95/11 129/6 referring [1] 131/16

R refers [2] 52/22 52/23 refresher [1] 135/24 refuse [1] 85/11 **Refusing [1]** 85/13 regard [1] 102/18 regarding [5] 18/19 24/11 51/25 57/20 62/13 region [2] 21/11 45/19 regional [2] 140/16 140/19 regions [2] 20/14 84/14 **regrettable** [1] 85/16 regroup [1] 142/3 regular [4] 15/1 29/17 29/17 128/14 regularly [1] 12/9 reimbursement [1] 97/17 **reiterate** [1] 7/15 rejected [1] 51/12 related [6] 18/24 18/24 20/4 35/16 64/2 128/17 relates [1] 30/11 relating [1] 29/3 relations [1] 78/12 release [5] 68/18 104/23 105/13 128/13 128/16 releases [1] 21/8 relevant [9] 56/23 105/4 119/17 119/20 120/21 129/14 129/16 129/17 130/1 relied [1] 28/10 relies [1] 109/2 reluctantly [1] 140/2 rely [2] 98/12 103/14 relying [2] 49/8 67/16 remain [2] 66/9 88/23 remained [2] 86/7 86/8 remaining [1] 61/6 remains [1] 70/23 **Remarkable [1]** 89/22 remedy [13] 66/5 66/11 68/24 69/4 69/6 71/4 71/8 72/1 77/23 80/5 81/18 81/21 82/10 remember [6] 96/12 98/7 103/22 106/24 114/4 114/6 **remove [1]** 13/6 removed [1] 7/20 Renata [2] 22/6 23/2 Renata Hesse [1] 22/6 render [1] 78/23 **rendering [1]** 78/1 repeatedly [1] 84/19

replace [1] 55/19 replies [1] 48/11 reply [5] 102/22 103/12 129/23 129/23 129/24 report [7] 17/22 28/1 28/5 31/2 102/17 118/3 128/10 **REPORTER [2]** 5/19 152/16 reporter's [1] 82/15 reporting [3] 47/5 47/6 47/9 reports [2] 19/7 48/7 represent [3] 106/12 123/23 126/2 representation [2] 31/6 108/23 representative [2] 26/18 66/23 representative's [1] 28/10 representatives [1] 78/18 represented [6] 12/24 26/23 38/22 39/13 66/22 67/9 reputational [1] 60/6 request [3] 60/15 72/22 123/7 requested [2] 74/19 78/12 requests [2] 17/11 78/13 require [1] 55/9 required [1] 73/22 requirement [1] 120/14 requires [4] 27/12 62/22 63/1 81/12 requiring [1] 68/25 reselling [1] 68/10 residents [1] 80/17 resists [1] 60/19 resolution [2] 79/2 79/7 resolve [1] 11/7 resolved [2] 35/15 82/8 resources [1] 148/6 respect [6] 12/11 13/23 14/4 16/20 17/21 69/22 respectfully [5] 81/3 95/11 95/23 123/7 150/9 respective [1] 35/7 respectively [1] 74/3 respond [3] 20/3 49/2 93/14 responds [2] 48/10 137/6 response [8] 16/9 44/5 48/22 61/16 64/24 68/10 112/10 112/23 responsible [1] 59/24 **responsive [1]** 96/19 rest [1] 130/10 restore [1] 69/2 rests [4] 40/7 101/15 101/16 102/4

result [11] 34/24 36/24 40/21 63/7 69/2 96/23 97/20 115/17 116/5 122/22 144/6 resulted [2] 18/20 19/24 resulting [2] 77/13 113/9 results [7] 47/13 47/19 48/7 49/17 58/1 58/10 121/18 retail [23] 44/2 44/24 45/10 67/10 67/14 68/6 68/9 72/6 72/10 72/15 72/18 72/21 73/2 73/7 73/11 75/13 75/17 75/19 76/4 93/23 132/20 148/15 148/18 retailer [2] 45/21 104/12 retailers [7] 105/15 131/17 132/4 133/23 134/19 136/10 138/6 retain [3] 28/23 29/4 147/17 retaining [1] 73/15 **retention [1]** 30/13 **return [1]** 137/22 returning [2] 71/7 76/12 reveal [1] 126/1 revenue [1] 76/3 revenues [2] 64/11 77/16 reverse [1] 145/6 reverses [1] 27/8 review [1] 16/22 **Revitalize** [1] 96/11 revitalized [1] 96/13 revolves [1] 14/10 **ride [1]** 102/10 right [42] 10/15 11/19 12/4 13/7 13/12 16/25 18/16 19/2 19/14 20/20 21/20 21/22 22/14 22/23 25/17 30/24 31/24 32/14 44/11 45/23 48/5 54/8 97/13 101/8 101/10 102/6 103/7 106/11 108/12 108/13 108/14 108/16 108/21 115/13 116/9 118/22 118/22 126/18 146/6 146/14 146/22 147/6 right-hand [1] 45/23 rise [2] 7/4 82/21 rises [1] 77/8 rising [3] 33/24 35/12 139/11 risk [13] 40/16 63/9 74/6 80/10 81/3 81/17 81/19 97/3 97/5 97/8 97/12 110/15 110/16 riskier [1] 21/5 risking [1] 63/7 risks [3] 76/9 81/15 118/11

R

Rives [1] 4/2 **RMR [2]** 5/19 152/15

road [2] 3/10 122/10

robust [1] 40/9

Rodney [3] 56/1 65/15 86/17 **Rodney McMullen [3]** 56/1

65/15 86/17

Roger [1] 30/24

Roger King [1] 30/24

Rohan [2] 2/7 8/9

rolled [1] 25/11

Room [1] 5/20

roots [1] 86/8

rough [1] 48/24

roughly [2] 89/13 93/5

Roundy's [2] 113/21 113/23

row [3] 53/2 53/2 53/2

rubber [1] 122/10

rubric [1] 57/13

rule [9] 13/11 27/13 44/2 44/25 45/2 45/3 45/21 46/7 57/25

ruling [4] 13/13 17/21 31/23 79/11

run [15] 34/3 68/12 73/1 74/25 77/2 85/5 93/6 94/4 94/6 94/18 128/9 131/9 147/8 148/4 148/5 running [5] 37/14 91/25 148/9

149/4 149/16 **runs [1]** 93/5

rural [1] 76/23

rush [1] 12/3

Russell [1] 3/10

S

S's [18] 19/4 21/24 67/14 67/20 68/15 68/17 72/11 72/21 73/25 76/12 76/14 76/22 76/24 78/8 78/13 97/22 97/23 146/24

S-215 [1] 2/13

S.W [6] 2/5 3/17 4/2 5/3 5/9 5/20 Safeway [8] 34/4 36/20 44/20

46/1 66/21 83/7 147/13 149/9

Safeway's [1] 48/3

said [17] 14/8 14/8 28/4 29/16 31/4 31/19 61/24 84/24 86/20 90/20 91/1 101/2 108/6 112/18 112/21 129/24 130/1

sailing [1] 45/11

sale [4] 68/15 90/19 96/17 143/5

Salem [1] 3/21

sales [20] 36/5 45/12 57/18 58/16 60/5 60/13 64/9 74/7 76/6 76/21 76/22 77/6 77/11 89/3 89/4 89/5 89/14 89/15 89/15 89/21

Sam's [4] 55/7 104/1 104/5 106/1

same [40] 15/11 28/2 28/18 29/1 40/15 41/10 46/13 46/15 51/10 53/25 55/5 55/20 63/22 67/1 72/9 72/11 72/13 74/25 83/11 89/9 90/25 94/24 98/19 113/17 113/21 113/23 115/23 122/14 125/18 125/19 126/9 126/17 131/5 136/10 138/18 144/8 148/4 148/9 148/10 149/13

San [1] 2/18

Sankaran [7] 10/13 56/1 141/18 142/15 143/6 144/11 146/24

Santa [5] 39/12 39/14 39/22 70/15 70/18

Sante [1] 3/15

Saturday [1] 18/19

sauce [1] 14/21

save [1] 92/2 **saved [1]** 139/11

savings [5] 91/11 91/15 91/19 92/5 113/9

saw [4] 9/13 102/24 114/20 117/21

say [39] 11/16 13/17 14/11 28/17 38/9 59/17 60/11 60/21 62/2 66/8 66/15 67/13 68/12 68/19 103/6 104/15 105/22 107/9 107/11 109/20 111/21 113/3 113/3 113/5 113/7 113/25 114/21 121/11 121/14 124/15 127/21 130/12 133/25 137/7 137/8 139/18 147/5 149/10 150/18

saying [6] 25/7 82/17 104/19 128/16 130/6 133/4

says [22] 17/3 29/22 29/22 30/14 52/14 68/2 68/11 78/7 103/17 105/2 105/16 105/17 105/18 105/23 107/1 108/12 109/7 117/19 127/3 127/16 131/25 136/16

scale [29] 20/17 65/8 73/22 91/11 91/15 92/22 92/24 125/12 125/13 125/14 126/8 126/8 126/10 126/19 126/20 128/19 129/9 133/15 133/15 139/15 140/9 140/15 141/6 142/8 142/10 142/13 146/11 146/14 146/25

scales [2] 65/11 78/9

scenario [3] 44/4 63/23 63/23

Scholer [1] 4/11 school [1] 131/6

Schultz [2] 4/10 9/10

scope [6] 11/13 12/14 12/21 36/11 63/8 65/7

scorers [1] 88/7

screen [10] 36/14 41/6 44/20 52/25 53/5 55/12 65/13 101/19 101/23 106/11

screwed [1] 108/18 seafood [1] 53/18

seal [3] 13/11 14/2 18/19

sealed [2] 14/1 19/8

seamless [2] 87/9 95/5

searching [1] 43/10 **seated [2]** 7/5 82/22

second [18] 24/16 26/1 36/5 40/12 49/9 51/8 51/24 52/14 53/13 55/11 58/6 59/6 63/12

64/14 78/3 106/23 129/3 132/15

secret [1] 14/20 secrets [1] 14/22

Section [4] 30/12 79/18 81/10 119/11

sector [1] 133/22

see [46] 16/4 20/17 22/16 32/1 37/21 38/1 38/21 40/19 42/23 43/22 44/9 44/11 44/13 44/19 44/23 45/25 47/14 47/21 48/1 48/13 50/13 52/7 52/25 54/10 54/21 55/3 55/12 56/15 62/14 65/13 80/17 83/14 86/6 96/18 97/15 97/22 111/2 111/20 112/3 118/2 132/25 133/19 134/6 134/7 140/24 148/10

seeing [1] 145/7

seeking [4] 35/4 35/7 67/7

129/10 seeks [1] 77/3

seem [1] 130/6

seems [1] 15/18 **seen [5]** 80/2 83/11 88/15

119/11 138/18

seismic [4] 129/7 129/7 132/8 142/16

Select [1] 147/21 selected [1] 67/17 selection [6] 34/9 53/4 54/10 54/21 55/5 105/1 sell [6] 88/5 117/10 125/15 125/17 125/24 126/13 selling [1] 125/20 sells [4] 125/19 126/3 126/3 139/24 **Senate [1]** 86/20 senior [7] 62/4 67/24 85/24 94/22 111/5 112/22 149/3 sense [17] 23/9 38/14 49/20 54/5 54/11 56/3 62/2 69/16 90/21 90/22 101/7 104/9 104/20 104/21 112/15 117/9 140/5 sensitive [7] 19/8 21/6 21/12 23/9 23/17 79/5 80/5 sent [1] 65/14 separate [3] 20/7 35/6 124/4 **separated** [1] 75/2 separately [3] 37/1 60/16 64/2 **September [1]** 32/8 **September 13th [1]** 32/8 series [1] 36/22 serious [6] 35/24 36/1 59/19 61/9 69/21 69/25 seriously [1] 126/23 **serpentine** [1] 99/23 serve [2] 34/14 79/19 **served [1]** 27/3 **serves [1]** 143/8 service [3] 88/7 93/2 98/22 services [14] 28/25 29/2 30/6 41/9 41/18 50/3 71/21 74/9 74/11 75/7 78/9 95/4 99/1 146/16 servicing [1] 85/22 **serving [1]** 73/15 session [3] 1/15 151/8 152/5 set [9] 42/11 43/24 44/21 45/7 47/22 50/19 67/9 141/23 145/23 sets [2] 24/6 115/15 setting [2] 111/22 117/7 **setup [1]** 145/15 seven [4] 43/7 98/2 121/19 136/14 **Seventh [1]** 145/22 several [6] 33/24 43/7 128/8 132/14 134/9 134/21 **Seymour [2]** 5/8 10/12

share [20] 38/24 39/15 39/16 39/17 57/11 70/24 70/25 71/2 75/1 77/11 77/13 80/22 103/16 103/16 116/14 131/18 135/22 135/23 136/12 136/15 **shared [2]** 14/17 15/23 shareholders [2] 132/22 142/5 shares [4] 46/16 57/14 90/9 130/16 sharing [3] 15/14 16/11 80/4 she [22] 22/6 26/20 26/21 26/21 26/23 27/3 29/11 29/13 29/15 29/15 29/16 31/17 31/19 81/1 84/24 94/17 95/10 101/2 135/18 137/17 148/21 149/3 she's [10] 94/18 94/20 135/17 135/22 148/19 148/20 148/25 149/21 150/4 150/5 shelf [1] 98/6 **shell [1]** 100/23 **shelves** [1] 98/14 **shift [9]** 85/12 88/14 129/6 129/7 129/8 132/8 143/17 145/6 145/22 **shifting [1]** 62/23 shifts [6] 61/15 101/17 102/1 102/23 135/16 142/16 **ship** [1] 96/20 **Shoe [4]** 51/20 55/17 127/16 127/16 **shoot [1]** 127/2 shop [16] 50/22 51/2 52/6 52/8 52/15 52/20 56/2 83/12 85/9 88/2 126/14 130/2 130/17 130/23 133/7 145/18 **shopped [1]** 128/15 shopper [6] 38/16 51/3 56/4 56/6 83/6 84/12 shoppers [19] 34/7 34/8 34/14 34/25 39/5 39/22 40/16 41/9 41/19 53/3 55/18 60/12 63/7 63/11 69/18 83/14 104/18 106/17 123/6 **shoppers' [2]** 40/1 85/17 shopping [19] 34/10 51/11 52/13 52/19 53/25 54/4 54/17 55/19 103/22 104/11 104/25 104/25 129/4 130/8 131/4 131/5 132/1 135/21 137/4 **shops** [1] 52/9 **Shore [1]** 65/23 **Shores [4]** 4/5 4/5 65/14 65/16

short [1] 151/4 **shorthand [2]** 110/23 110/25 **shots** [1] 149/16 **should [18]** 13/6 14/16 15/1 31/5 63/15 65/11 67/21 69/21 77/1 82/8 85/8 89/6 99/9 105/23 109/24 126/22 130/8 144/17 **shouldn't [5]** 105/3 105/16 105/17 105/19 109/22 **show [53]** 39/25 40/3 40/12 41/3 41/7 41/11 42/9 42/24 43/16 45/24 48/6 49/6 49/12 51/1 55/15 55/17 56/25 58/12 59/1 59/3 60/17 61/8 62/17 62/18 62/19 63/4 64/22 65/1 65/24 69/6 69/21 69/25 70/2 71/4 71/24 99/6 101/12 102/1 102/2 102/5 103/8 110/13 110/20 118/24 120/1 121/23 122/3 127/25 132/21 136/18 136/22 140/5 144/24 showed [3] 90/8 90/24 114/4 **showing [11]** 33/1 33/5 36/3 36/8 36/8 36/9 40/9 48/14 55/23 69/1 77/9 **shown [6]** 44/23 53/1 53/4 53/5 74/9 76/19 **shows [12]** 20/18 36/15 39/14 44/24 45/14 45/17 46/6 56/13 77/6 93/24 107/13 136/17 **shrinking** [1] 145/7 side [4] 14/12 45/23 102/25 102/25 sign [2] 11/22 132/21 signature [5] 147/21 152/11 152/12 152/12 152/16 signed [4] 78/8 92/13 148/15 152/12 significant [10] 49/17 50/4 57/8 91/2 91/6 91/7 106/13 115/15 135/6 147/8 significantly [2] 45/10 109/10 signing [2] 79/9 152/8 **Silva [2]** 42/2 46/22 similar [4] 21/2 48/7 89/17 117/21 similarly [4] 35/7 54/25 59/9 104/23 simple [7] 43/25 53/11 90/24 103/13 106/16 110/22 120/9 simply [6] 35/19 55/20 74/20 101/5 111/10 115/24

simultaneously [1] 71/17 since [5] 22/1 22/9 84/21 132/20 133/22 sing [1] 110/12 single [7] 53/15 55/13 69/22 69/23 81/24 84/14 113/14 **singularly [1]** 111/6 **sip [1]** 96/14 sitting [2] 7/12 7/19 **situation [2]** 115/2 115/2 **situations** [1] 51/2 six [2] 39/1 110/1 six-tenths [1] 110/1 sixth [3] 109/21 143/18 145/8 sixth-tenths [1] 109/21 size [2] 122/4 122/5 sizes [1] 53/14 **skepticism** [1] 67/25 skills [1] 94/1 sleight [1] 96/24 slide [15] 20/16 44/7 45/1 45/3 45/14 46/4 47/4 48/12 58/14 74/8 74/22 76/15 76/19 102/24 119/25 slides [7] 32/25 33/5 44/9 44/9 114/4 114/20 122/2 **slightly [2]** 64/11 102/18 **slips [1]** 105/6 sliver [3] 82/6 120/22 130/14 slower [1] 76/4 **slowing [1]** 132/21 **small [7]** 50/4 57/8 63/20 78/15 98/11 130/7 141/2 **smaller [3]** 54/9 54/9 54/20 smudged [1] 106/11 **snacks [1]** 53/18 snapshot [2] 61/5 89/1 so [101] so-called [2] 132/18 133/18 **software [1]** 74/13 sold [2] 72/7 87/19 some [37] 19/7 22/17 22/18 32/3 36/13 40/18 41/5 44/21 47/17 69/20 76/25 86/13 92/14 92/15 95/20 98/2 98/2 105/14 117/1 118/8 124/1 124/2 125/17 130/20 131/2 131/9 133/13 136/18 136/20 136/25 137/11 139/21 140/15 146/6 146/17 147/8 149/25 somebody [1] 143/5

somehow [3] 7/19 118/21 143/3 stand [3] 68/9 122/7 123/9 **someone [3]** 7/19 105/7 115/25 something [7] 23/14 94/11 94/12 108/18 129/24 146/13 149/8 **sometimes [2]** 129/16 135/18 somewhat [2] 29/9 93/17 somewhere [5] 22/9 38/18 136/5 136/6 137/10 son's [1] 55/5 **Sonia [2]** 4/9 9/10 Sonia Pfaffenroth [1] 9/10 soon [1] 11/25 sooner [1] 79/7 **Soopers [4]** 47/15 48/4 48/23 49/1 sort [3] 13/2 14/10 20/20 sought [1] 79/7 **sound [1]** 145/11 sourcing [2] 84/11 88/6 **Southeast [2]** 91/4 91/6 **southern [2]** 37/15 46/25 **Southwest [1]** 83/7 **space [3]** 22/19 131/19 132/19 span [1] 148/24 **spanning** [1] 37/14 **sparing [1]** 31/14 speaking [2] 30/23 96/15 specialists [1] 94/23 specific [6] 13/1 16/22 53/10 62/20 63/6 116/19 specifically [4] 63/20 66/24 83/17 146/15 specifics [1] 25/20 **spend [2]** 84/6 136/2 spending [3] 103/25 136/4 143/11 **spends [1]** 136/1 spent [5] 64/12 103/20 140/20 148/17 149/1 **sports** [1] 51/4 **spread [2]** 45/4 46/10 **Sprouts [3]** 54/2 54/18 104/6 **spurs** [1] 35/13 **squeezed [1]** 33/25 **St [1]** 3/6 stack [2] 74/14 147/23 stacks [1] 92/1 **stage [1]** 69/10 staged [1] 80/20 stake [2] 47/20 96/20 stakes [2] 64/7 150/7

standalone [1] 73/1 standard [11] 52/1 56/22 56/23 69/9 81/7 81/10 82/4 95/19 95/24 96/3 115/16 **standards** [1] 69/13 standpoint [3] 146/22 146/22 148/2 stands [2] 67/21 101/6 **star [1]** 44/19 **Starbucks** [1] 96/2 **stark [1]** 67/21 **start [11]** 24/3 31/24 38/1 40/2 40/18 41/5 60/7 96/4 115/23 124/22 151/5 started [3] 32/17 56/4 92/19 **Starting [1]** 50/17 startling [1] 133/20 **starts [3]** 29/5 80/14 126/2 state [26] 2/12 2/16 3/1 3/5 3/9 3/12 3/16 3/23 3/24 7/22 8/12 8/18 8/21 8/23 9/2 9/4 9/7 20/19 21/8 35/7 38/3 39/13 64/7 79/12 80/15 100/4 stated [2] 72/17 84/19 statement [14] 6/3 6/4 6/5 21/18 27/23 28/13 33/12 33/14 83/4 93/15 95/10 101/8 117/22 123/19 statements [13] 6/2 16/2 21/15 32/15 33/9 41/6 41/7 61/20 62/7 62/8 82/23 101/1 128/10 Stater [2] 50/9 53/24 states [21] 1/1 1/18 5/19 20/22 35/2 37/3 37/6 37/14 37/15 74/4 80/19 86/9 90/17 91/7 93/3 96/25 97/2 105/10 134/21 135/4 147/13 states' [1] 80/17 stating [1] 27/17 statistically [1] 109/10 status [3] 47/11 150/19 150/21 stay [5] 25/25 32/1 68/20 112/1 112/2 staying [2] 98/17 138/1 steal [1] 48/1 stenographic [1] 152/10 step [5] 36/11 57/9 100/19 102/6 110/17 Stewart [2] 5/6 10/1 stick [1] 51/15 still [8] 23/25 25/10 58/15 86/6

still... [4] 129/19 130/7 137/11 139/20 stipulation [1] 11/17 stock [2] 96/20 132/17 stocked [2] 98/14 145/15 Stoel [2] 4/2 9/11 **stop [18]** 20/3 35/14 43/15 50/21 52/6 52/8 52/12 52/19 52/20 53/25 103/22 129/4 130/2 130/8 130/16 130/22 131/10 131/25 **Stopping [1]** 35/10 store [53] 19/1 44/22 49/1 49/1 51/4 51/9 51/15 53/11 53/21 54/3 54/8 54/14 55/10 55/15 55/19 59/6 66/9 70/10 70/22 70/23 71/1 72/18 72/24 73/18 74/11 75/13 84/10 85/5 88/1 88/1 93/23 95/13 104/25 106/7 106/19 116/1 117/5 117/6 123/3 125/1 129/20 137/25 143/24 144/2 144/23 145/10 145/11 145/14 146/19 147/3 148/20 148/23 148/25 **store's [1]** 67/11 **store-level [1]** 117/5 storefront [1] 73/20 stores [161] **stores' [1]** 76/12 **story [3]** 39/10 92/19 119/14 strange [1] 98/8 strategic [2] 72/18 140/3 strategy [5] 44/20 111/5 111/24 112/16 128/6 **streamline** [1] 17/5 street [15] 2/5 2/13 2/22 3/3 3/14 3/17 3/20 4/14 4/17 5/3 70/16 83/7 88/16 105/12 131/23 streets [1] 86/6 stretch [1] 86/22 stricken [3] 28/12 31/20 31/21 strike [8] 17/22 60/2 60/7 60/7 60/9 60/11 78/1 78/7 strikes [2] 60/1 60/4 strive [1] 87/7 striving [1] 99/4 **stronger [1]** 144/23 **struck [1]** 78/19 **structural [2]** 68/24 139/7 **structure [4]** 49/14 57/14 94/7 142/19

struggle [3] 73/14 78/6 145/4 **struggles** [1] 77/5 struggling [1] 77/3 **Stuart [1]** 87/16 **Stuart Aitken [1]** 87/16 stuck [2] 60/22 61/3 **studies [1]** 19/4 study [4] 23/13 24/8 79/1 108/7 **stuff [1]** 117/10 subject [3] 74/16 119/8 119/13 submit [3] 81/3 85/23 124/12 submitted [1] 80/16 substantial [19] 27/12 35/24 36/2 40/21 59/19 61/9 66/5 71/11 74/7 75/23 79/1 81/13 81/22 102/2 110/16 110/19 110/21 114/14 118/24 substantially [7] 40/15 49/19 56/11 61/10 69/8 105/14 119/19 substitutes [2] 51/7 130/4 **Subway [2]** 121/16 121/20 succeed [3] 66/14 67/10 143/3 **succeeded** [1] 133/14 success [11] 20/25 67/19 100/8 100/11 101/11 107/25 118/25 139/9 141/24 145/23 149/24 successful [2] 71/15 73/2 successfully [2] 94/9 138/24 such [27] 34/3 40/5 40/6 42/6 46/1 50/9 50/11 52/4 52/9 53/8 54/11 54/25 55/7 56/2 60/20 62/10 63/14 65/10 69/7 72/14 78/6 83/24 120/7 120/22 120/25 121/9 122/20 **suffer [3]** 49/21 60/5 63/22 sufficient [9] 50/2 59/4 62/9 62/20 63/2 63/8 69/5 69/17 97/8 sufficiently [2] 66/11 69/6 **suggest [8]** 82/14 82/16 83/23 84/22 97/7 110/3 138/22 144/17 suggestion [2] 68/10 99/16 suggestions [1] 93/15 suggests [3] 68/14 99/8 118/4 suit [2] 84/21 85/7 Suite [7] 2/13 2/18 3/10 3/17 4/2 survive [2] 127/9 128/24 4/14 5/3 **Sullivan [1]** 23/3 **Summary [1]** 111/23 summed [1] 88/16 supercenters [4] 40/6 50/11 129/18 130/12 supermarket [41] 36/4 36/23

40/3 40/4 40/7 45/8 45/12 49/11 50/15 50/18 50/21 51/5 51/9 51/15 52/22 53/1 54/21 55/6 55/19 57/5 57/17 58/2 58/22 59/13 69/24 70/9 72/4 73/15 73/19 78/22 81/1 94/1 102/12 102/23 103/10 104/3 129/4 130/2 130/23 135/12 137/13 supermarket's [1] 50/7 supermarkets [27] 33/20 34/3 36/16 36/25 39/1 50/8 52/6 52/21 53/7 53/13 53/17 53/24 55/15 55/18 56/14 56/16 56/18 57/1 57/6 58/9 77/12 88/17 128/24 129/18 130/12 135/9 140/16 supplied [1] 76/25 supplier [2] 92/20 96/21 **supplies [1]** 131/6 **supply [9]** 72/8 74/12 75/7 91/21 98/5 98/23 140/22 146/25 149/19 **support [18]** 39/25 41/18 51/17 56/8 56/9 56/20 59/12 59/14 59/25 63/13 63/16 80/16 88/7 93/5 93/6 93/10 119/5 120/5 supported [6] 52/1 54/5 54/11 56/7 57/13 61/20 supporting [1] 146/20 supports [1] 135/10 **supposed [1]** 15/25 **supposedly [1]** 144/18 **Supreme [3]** 49/16 63/14 96/1 sure [14] 14/1 15/25 16/6 17/24 21/13 25/21 30/20 31/11 32/1 32/6 37/19 95/4 96/6 130/6 surprise [3] 62/6 83/8 134/8 surprised [3] 111/16 134/6 134/7 surprising [2] 125/21 125/22 **surrebuttal [2]** 17/22 18/3 surreply [2] 18/7 18/9 surrounding [1] 39/8 **survival [1]** 127/8 **Susan [7]** 2/3 8/2 10/14 33/14 47/7 94/15 148/13 **Susan Morris [2]** 94/15 148/13 Susan Musser [2] 8/2 33/14 suspend [1] 79/8 **swallowing [1]** 34/24 **swoop [1]** 35/1

S

Sysco [2] 68/25 69/13 system [2] 148/3 148/4 systems [1] 74/18

Т

table [9] 11/12 33/18 34/1 34/19 59/19 60/3 90/16 142/23 144/10 tackle [1] 141/20 Taco [1] 120/21 tactic [1] 78/1 tactics [1] 60/18 tailored [1] 65/7 take [20] 60/24 78/10 78/14 82/18 96/14 106/22 109/15 112/12 117/19 117/25 118/5 122/7 126/22 127/18 129/11 138/22 140/11 143/25 146/6 151/3

taken [6] 41/6 44/11 79/9 82/20 139/10 152/9

takes [3] 50/14 72/23 136/14 taking [10] 19/6 25/1 36/11 58/21 90/9 98/1 124/17 138/6 140/1 142/19

talented [1] 149/21

talk [22] 26/14 29/25 58/6 90/12 90/14 92/5 94/3 99/10 100/23 101/4 102/3 102/6 115/11 119/2 129/12 130/15 130/17 133/2 135/22 138/21 144/13 145/23 talked [5] 11/2 88/6 96/25

143/20 143/20

talking [10] 29/12 68/13 96/2 97/6 97/10 124/10 133/8 136/10 137/3

talks [1] 119/11

Talley [1] 3/23

tap [1] 99/17

Target [18] 40/6 50/12 58/18 58/21 61/25 87/11 93/12 105/17 106/18 107/12 128/3 128/13 131/5 131/8 133/12 136/24 137/20 142/11

Target's [1] 45/4

targeted [1] 47/25

targeting [1] 60/8

targets [3] 80/22 125/12 127/22 team [2] 137/17 137/23

teapot [1] 29/20

teardrops [1] 38/22

tech [3] 74/14 92/1 147/23

technology [3] 91/25 93/24 148/2

tectonic [3] 85/12 88/13 129/6 Teeter [2] 98/9 113/17 tell [21] 12/1 30/3 37/21 38/15 87/17 94/15 94/16 102/25 103/7 110/25 122/19 135/17 135/20 136/25 142/6 142/9 142/15 143/6 143/13 146/24 150/10

telling [3] 52/12 129/24 133/5 tells [3] 115/14 117/23 124/20 tempest [1] 29/20

ten [1] 90/6

tentative [1] 20/13

tenths [3] 109/21 110/1 114/10 **term [4]** 67/25 138/16 141/16 141/24

terms [17] 15/15 15/16 28/16 59/18 60/10 61/3 88/21 89/8 89/21 102/20 106/16 116/4 117/9 120/9 130/16 143/23 149/18

test [13] 51/25 56/21 56/22 57/2 57/5 68/25 95/24 96/2 108/10 108/11 108/20 109/13 109/13 testified [4] 26/17 26/20 28/8 73/3

testify [10] 27/19 47/1 65/15 67/15 67/18 68/3 68/15 134/16 136/3 147/25

testifying [4] 27/20 31/16 119/16 141/19

testimony [26] 18/10 26/25 27/8 27/18 28/10 28/18 29/8 29/10 29/11 29/14 30/10 31/5 40/9 40/25 41/25 48/13 51/20 51/24 54/5 54/12 56/8 59/23 67/17 119/16 119/19 124/3

Texas [6] 91/3 91/7 110/6 110/8 140/16 140/20

text [5] 48/9 59/12 60/20 65/13 65/14

textured [1] 116/16 than [58] 12/21 14/18 22/18 32/5 45/10 54/21 58/3 61/8 64/10 64/11 68/7 75/10 75/14 76/1 76/4 77/2 77/16 83/12 83/14 85/3 85/10 85/21 85/22 85/25 89/14 90/10 91/25 93/3 95/1 95/14 104/4 104/10 104/12 106/18 108/6 108/17 109/8 110/2 115/18 116/17 118/9 119/9 121/5 121/14 121/20 122/4 122/8 124/23 125/21 125/23 126/11 130/19 134/10 134/15 136/6 146/21 147/3 148/17

thank [21] 10/16 11/4 12/1 17/14 25/15 25/23 30/1 31/8 31/9 32/23 33/13 82/11 82/12 82/19 83/2 101/25 123/11 123/12 151/2 151/3 151/7

that [712]

that's [63] 11/24 14/3 14/25 16/7 19/10 21/5 21/17 24/21 24/22 27/24 28/22 31/5 31/23 32/3 44/10 65/20 73/4 82/17 89/5 89/6 89/7 92/22 95/11 95/13 98/8 99/18 100/24 102/12 102/13 103/11 103/12 103/23 106/6 106/19 107/3 108/20 109/20 110/8 110/11 111/7 111/8 112/4 113/20 114/12 116/7 120/21 122/5 123/24 124/20 126/5 126/14 126/22 129/18 131/16 131/20 132/8 133/11 136/17 137/16 143/6 144/19 145/4 149/20

their [167]

them [54] 13/25 14/3 16/6 19/6 23/15 23/19 23/20 23/23 24/15 25/21 28/15 48/10 52/11 63/20 67/12 68/12 74/4 82/1 83/15 87/4 87/5 90/15 90/15 91/8 91/18 92/2 92/8 92/8 92/9 94/4 94/9 98/13 103/5 103/6 106/3 106/15 107/6 112/8 113/4 113/21 116/14 117/18 121/13 121/15 125/14 126/13 126/16 128/7 129/2 130/17 133/6 133/7 139/9 140/22

theme [2] 47/10 47/11 themselves [2] 8/3 78/18 then [32] 16/3 20/18 20/20 60/9 61/15 62/15 68/21 72/13 91/19 92/12 101/10 101/17 102/17 102/21 102/24 103/25 104/1 108/15 108/17 109/5 113/23 115/4 119/2 128/13 128/15 130/25 131/3 131/9 131/11 140/15 143/4 147/23

theory [5] 119/2 120/5 121/18 128/19 144/20 there [100] Т

there's [33] 13/10 14/4 16/21 18/7 29/19 45/23 47/10 49/23 57/6 59/25 63/25 97/2 99/20 100/1 100/15 100/18 101/3 102/1 106/5 109/19 112/2 115/14 122/15 122/16 128/13 128/17 131/14 136/21 138/17 139/24 140/21 144/24 147/23

thereby [1] 125/15 therefore [9] 28/20 65/19 82/8 91/22 107/16 108/16 109/1

109/7 142/13

these [87] they [222]

they'll [6] 95/14 131/12 138/21 146/9 147/9 151/5

they're [52] 7/19 16/3 18/23 20/20 21/9 29/20 30/9 33/19 43/4 47/12 47/12 48/6 60/14 62/19 63/6 90/4 90/6 94/14 95/3 95/3 97/15 97/22 97/24 97/24 98/1 98/15 98/16 98/16 98/19 104/15 104/19 106/24 107/9 107/12 109/9 109/9 113/4 113/5 128/11 128/25 129/1 131/3 131/4 133/6 133/9 133/17 134/24 135/1 137/11 147/19 147/21 149/9

they've [13] 87/24 88/22 89/21 101/13 102/18 109/19 118/22 128/7 132/12 133/14 139/4 139/10 148/1

thing [15] 15/11 31/15 113/21 113/23 113/25 120/7 120/22 120/25 122/20 126/9 128/10 129/5 140/12 141/25 147/5 things [12] 12/2 22/17 62/19 87/17 116/10 125/14 131/12 137/11 139/12 142/22 150/16 150/19

think [37] 11/6 14/23 17/1 17/4 17/10 20/23 21/6 21/17 21/20 22/14 23/17 23/22 26/12 27/24 28/14 29/1 29/9 29/19 29/19 29/21 30/5 31/5 85/4 88/15 99/21 102/17 105/3 106/19 111/16 115/14 121/24 127/21 138/18 141/1 146/9 149/7 149/25

thinking [2] 23/5 24/18 third [9] 5/20 52/3 53/17 63/8 64/18 78/18 80/4 103/14 138/8 third-party [1] 103/14 thirds [3] 75/14 97/4 97/10 this [307]

Thomas [1] 5/8
those [62] 14/15 14/17 20/25
23/12 25/11 44/15 51/10 55/16
57/6 57/7 57/18 58/4 58/21
58/22 60/12 60/19 62/14 64/15
71/23 73/16 74/1 75/7 75/25
76/19 77/1 77/3 83/11 83/13
88/10 94/9 94/24 98/3 98/8
98/19 100/5 104/14 104/18
114/4 114/8 116/9 117/16
122/18 125/7 125/9 126/12
127/24 127/25 130/2 139/9
139/11 139/11 140/18 143/4
143/14 143/25 144/8 144/11
146/6 146/17 147/17 147/22

though [4] 98/16 107/13 108/3 110/1

148/10

thought [4] 24/14 31/14 110/6 130/22

thousands [6] 34/1 36/3 40/13 58/15 80/8 94/22

threat [9] 60/1 60/1 97/3 102/2 110/21 114/15 114/16 118/24 134/22

threatening [1] 60/8 three [20] 7/9 15/24 30/18 51/17 53/4 70/18 73/23 75/5 76/5 79/15 80/19 87/19 88/19 89/7 99/7 100/22 113/13 113/13 118/24 146/5

three-week [1] 7/9 threshold [2] 57/18 114/7 thresholds [1] 57/13 thrive [1] 148/21 through [46] 14/13 14/22

through [46] 14/13 14/22 16/18 24/18 24/25 33/8 34/8 36/22 38/25 41/23 46/12 46/18 47/23 47/23 47/23 48/1 50/2 52/5 64/13 64/16 65/1 66/17 67/4 80/3 81/16 84/9 84/16 89/18 99/22 100/18 123/10 124/14 125/5 125/9 128/9 133/16 138/9 140/14 142/23 143/9 144/10 145/9 147/8 148/19 149/22 150/15

throughout [20] 38/15 41/2 42/23 44/23 45/25 49/6 49/14

53/20 55/14 55/22 58/17 58/25 59/22 61/5 61/7 61/12 84/1 97/2 132/14 140/24

thus [2] 75/22 78/21 tight [1] 22/16 tilt [1] 78/9

Tim [2] 3/19 8/13

time [38] 13/7 17/4 32/5 35/21 38/9 39/6 39/23 43/3 48/15 56/16 56/19 60/23 61/4 72/11 79/5 79/6 80/21 82/6 82/13 82/17 89/9 92/12 95/25 95/25 122/7 123/11 130/21 131/5 132/20 137/2 137/19 138/19 140/20 144/1 148/19 150/7 150/19 151/2

time-sensitive [1] 79/5 timeline [1] 25/12 timely [2] 59/4 150/24 times [4] 104/10 116/2 130/5 147/2

timewise [1] 151/5

timing [2] 15/16 15/22
Tina [1] 48/9
tiny [2] 120/22 130/14
tip [1] 65/11
title [2] 131/24 131/25
today [46] 8/13 11/18 13/11
22/2 22/7 30/6 30/18 32/5 33/1
33/6 35/18 36/25 37/13 41/19
41/25 42/14 50/9 57/4 59/15
60/16 66/3 76/10 78/17 90/15
91/1 93/2 93/4 93/22 94/1 94/2
94/24 95/18 102/24 111/4 120/6
122/8 127/6 131/1 131/2 134/23

148/5 148/16

Todd [3] 48/2 48/21 65/14

Todd Broderick [2] 48/21 65/14

together [11] 12/17 13/10 33/17
37/11 75/16 86/20 91/8 91/18
102/10 122/6 143/15

135/5 135/13 141/19 147/16

toilet [2] 137/21 137/25 told [9] 23/19 32/3 66/12 67/1 96/1 96/17 116/19 122/10 128/5 Tom [1] 10/9

tomatoes [3] 53/5 137/22 138/1 tomorrow [4] 22/21 41/25 94/4 111/4

tonight [1] 11/23 Tony [2] 42/2 46/22 Tony Silva [1] 42/2 Т

too [11] 11/23 15/12 54/10 54/14 56/17 78/15 96/15 98/15 107/13 141/2 141/2 took [4] 38/9 39/6 39/22 112/11 tool [2] 57/22 60/2 tools [1] 43/24 toothpaste [4] 137/11 137/18 137/21 137/25 top [3] 70/16 88/7 144/6 topics [1] 26/19 **Tops [3]** 67/8 67/8 76/17 Torres [2] 2/20 8/25 tortuous [1] 99/22 torture [1] 110/12 Tostitos [1] 53/16 total [5] 57/11 57/18 64/11 80/20 110/10 totally [1] 21/4 touch [2] 72/3 143/18 tout [2] 72/14 76/16 towards [1] 65/11 track [3] 32/1 71/22 120/24 **TRADE [11]** 1/3 2/3 2/4 2/8 7/6 8/2 8/6 8/8 8/10 105/9 152/3 Trader [7] 54/15 54/19 54/24 95/15 104/7 106/1 107/8 traditional [12] 40/5 45/7 45/10 45/12 50/8 85/14 106/13 129/4 129/18 132/18 134/1 135/8 traditionally [1] 131/17 traffic [3] 34/7 48/19 117/14 transaction [14] 29/6 35/5 35/15 35/19 39/24 40/15 61/9 63/10 69/11 69/16 69/22 79/11 81/14 82/9 **transactions** [1] 72/19 transcript [4] 1/16 6/6 152/9 152/11 **transcripts** [1] 18/22 transfer [3] 95/6 97/16 97/19 **transferred** [1] 84/15 transfers [1] 100/5 transformative [2] 66/17 67/4 transition [15] 28/24 28/25 29/2 29/5 29/7 29/7 29/13 30/6 32/14 68/21 71/21 74/9 75/7 78/9 95/3 transportation [1] 117/16 travel [2] 106/14 121/19 treasure [1] 54/19 treatment [1] 26/19 Tree [3] 54/2 54/9 134/15

tremendous [1] 138/13 trend [1] 36/23 trends [2] 48/18 135/21 trial [31] 13/25 22/10 22/14 27/7 27/19 79/12 82/5 92/15 119/10 121/23 124/8 124/25 127/12 130/21 133/21 134/16 135/11 138/9 138/18 138/25 140/14 141/17 143/19 145/1 146/13 147/1 147/10 147/23 147/25 150/11 150/20 trick [1] 68/20 tried [4] 130/13 139/1 139/2 144/16 tries [3] 42/21 44/17 135/24 trivial [1] 89/16 true [11] 71/23 86/7 86/8 114/23 126/5 126/17 130/24 130/25 133/11 139/15 152/9 truly [2] 12/19 89/25 truncate [1] 32/5 truncated [1] 31/25 trust [1] 7/14 trusted [2] 67/21 86/13 **truth [2]** 53/12 135/20 try [12] 11/2 17/10 17/12 42/17 43/8 47/25 60/10 61/24 141/23 142/3 146/6 150/10 trying [18] 15/21 16/6 16/6 28/15 32/5 41/8 43/4 44/15 46/8 48/17 48/18 68/9 81/7 89/8 114/25 128/12 145/17 146/3 **TSA [1]** 28/25 Tucker [2] 3/9 8/23 Tucson [1] 2/14 tuition [1] 97/16 turn [20] 34/2 34/6 34/11 37/4 46/4 46/14 50/3 58/21 66/1 68/22 73/9 100/8 101/2 108/3 108/6 111/7 115/5 119/3 122/23 130/20 turned [2] 101/3 140/4 turning [8] 41/24 42/11 44/7 55/21 73/6 75/12 76/14 77/21 turns [2] 81/9 115/12 twelve [2] 67/7 76/17 two [49] 16/10 18/22 24/6 24/25 26/5 30/9 31/19 34/25 36/2 36/25 37/8 38/4 40/7 40/23 41/25 42/2 42/4 42/12 43/24

45/25 48/6 50/6 50/8 50/23

51/10 51/23 58/22 58/23 59/15

64/19 65/2 75/14 79/9 97/4 97/10 99/10 100/21 122/18 124/18 128/16 132/10 134/1 134/19 136/11 140/8 142/6 143/15 144/22 150/17 two-thirds [3] 75/14 97/4 97/10 twofold [1] 62/22 Tyler [2] 5/7 10/2 Tyler Infinger [1] 10/2 type [7] 7/18 48/12 52/24 54/17 59/6 125/18 126/18 types [5] 40/14 41/1 42/10 44/13 44/14 typical [1] 107/1

U.S [2] 130/14 130/18 ultimate [1] 100/11 ultimately [3] 23/11 141/24 unable [4] 61/16 62/9 65/24 81/17 unambiguous [1] 111/16 unambiguously [2] 99/7 99/8 under [15] 17/7 28/13 44/14 45/15 55/17 62/23 63/23 63/24 68/22 68/25 74/10 75/6 86/9 93/21 110/3 under-inclusive [1] 110/3 underneath [1] 132/12 underperforming [1] 72/6 understand [17] 14/20 15/21 15/22 16/20 20/13 21/7 21/10 33/7 37/22 38/12 84/22 86/2 120/9 127/17 127/18 138/9 understanding [10] 12/23 15/13 21/14 27/1 27/21 28/4 28/9 28/16 31/7 31/21 **Understood** [1] 22/3 undertaken [1] 139/4 undertaking [1] 68/6 underway [1] 125/5 undisputed [1] 124/24 unenforceable [1] 65/5 unexpectedly [1] 26/2 unfair [1] 27/24 union [51] 34/16 35/1 36/6 59/15 59/21 59/23 59/24 61/12 67/12 72/5 77/17 78/1 78/15 78/17 81/19 85/18 87/25 88/2 89/10 89/16 89/23 95/7 119/5

union... [28] 119/6 119/17 119/23 120/2 120/7 120/22 120/25 121/4 121/9 121/12 121/14 121/16 121/20 122/3 122/5 122/15 122/17 122/21 123/2 123/5 144/14 144/18 144/22 144/23 145/2 145/3 145/4 145/7 union's [1] 60/15 unionized [1] 88/1 unions [6] 59/16 60/3 60/6 96/8 122/9 144/19 unique [6] 50/20 50/21 63/13 79/5 106/7 119/6 uniquely [1] 148/20 united [7] 1/1 1/18 5/19 33/16 93/3 105/10 134/20 unknown [3] 21/4 74/4 74/6 unlawful [3] 70/11 70/17 81/18 unless [3] 61/24 64/15 85/14 unlike [5] 87/24 89/11 89/23 89/24 110/6 unlikely [1] 71/24 unprecedented [3] 38/10 73/24 119/6 unredacted [1] 32/25 **unremedied** [1] 70/3 unsettled [1] 23/25 **unsupported** [1] 119/7 Unsurprisingly [1] 39/5 until [4] 28/11 75/1 76/11 79/11 **unusual [1]** 16/12 unwind [1] 79/22 up [49] 16/15 16/16 18/3 18/4 19/9 20/15 22/6 25/25 27/5 28/10 32/4 46/16 67/10 68/9 74/12 75/5 83/16 86/10 88/16 92/24 93/1 93/9 96/10 97/18 99/24 101/6 103/6 108/18 109/25 110/9 114/25 115/3 115/15 117/10 117/11 117/15 117/16 117/16 122/1 123/13 124/8 124/19 127/2 132/4 134/13 138/1 141/23 145/23 151/5 upcoming [4] 39/24 59/11 61/7 124/1 **update [2]** 11/3 105/13 **updates** [1] 11/6 updating [1] 49/4 **upon [1]** 112/13

UPS [2] 121/7 121/15 us [33] 23/16 24/13 30/3 31/12 31/25 32/5 82/6 90/21 91/10 92/7 92/23 94/16 95/18 96/1 100/18 103/4 103/25 104/17 104/18 105/7 115/3 115/6 115/7 115/14 115/16 117/23 121/12 122/19 124/20 133/25 134/18 141/18 148/16 use [24] 17/7 21/10 23/6 23/24 24/15 24/19 25/10 29/16 30/12 37/17 43/25 56/23 57/3 60/6 66/22 73/25 74/3 98/12 115/23 116/13 117/1 117/13 117/14 147/17 used [6] 15/5 23/22 52/1 85/1 116/15 130/19 useless [1] 78/2 uses [13] 42/12 43/24 44/1 45/3 voluminous [1] 82/7 56/25 70/5 116/18 116/20 117/2 117/2 117/4 117/5 117/18 using [3] 45/3 57/22 110/23 **Usman [1]** 61/23 **Utah [1]** 46/25

Vacura [1] 3/17 vacuum [1] 139/18 validate [1] 63/19 validated [1] 51/14 validates [1] 40/1 Vallarta [1] 106/2 valuable [1] 23/15 value [11] 75/11 77/15 77/19 83/20 105/2 115/18 128/17 130/2 134/18 135/10 142/4 valued [1] 75/14 variable [9] 116/2 116/24 117/1 117/3 118/1 118/4 118/12 118/14 118/16 variety [4] 12/6 53/21 74/11 146/5 various [3] 49/5 73/10 139/3 vast [1] 14/8 vastly [1] 81/17 Vegas [1] 3/11 verifiable [1] 62/19 verify [2] 63/20 64/16 Verizon [1] 62/3 version [2] 33/5 112/19 versus [1] 122/16 very [23] 16/12 18/20 21/4 22/7

30/8 31/9 31/9 50/1 84/19 87/20 90/12 101/25 105/21 116/15 116/16 116/22 117/18 117/21 126/22 129/24 130/7 145/2 151/2 viability [2] 25/1 68/1 Vice [1] 111/17 view [6] 19/22 29/1 55/18 65/19 129/19 132/23 views [2] 68/5 124/1 vigorous [1] 35/11 Vine [1] 4/17 violates [1] 27/9 visit [1] 104/12 vital [2] 94/12 95/15 Vivek [3] 10/13 56/1 141/18 Vivek Sankaran [2] 56/1 141/18 volumes [1] 76/22 vote [1] 115/25 **voting [1]** 116/2 **VP [2]** 61/24 135/16

W

wages [14] 34/19 60/15 61/1 84/7 97/15 117/10 122/15 122/17 122/22 123/2 143/13 143/23 144/3 144/7 wait [1] 112/21 waiting [1] 100/6 Walgreens [2] 95/15 105/18 walk [4] 86/6 100/17 103/18 145/14 walked [2] 52/5 65/1 walking [2] 62/6 83/6 **Wall [2]** 88/16 131/23 wallet [6] 103/16 103/17 135/22 135/23 136/12 136/15 wallets [1] 138/7 Walmart [75] 40/6 42/12 45/4 45/5 46/11 50/11 58/18 58/21 61/25 71/19 85/15 87/13 87/14 87/23 88/18 89/1 89/2 89/11 90/1 90/8 90/25 91/9 92/10 95/16 99/4 103/25 106/18 107/11 107/20 109/1 109/6 109/14 110/22 110/23 110/24 111/1 111/5 111/10 111/12 111/13 111/14 111/15 111/17 111/18 111/21 112/5 112/8 113/15 114/6 114/25 115/5 115/6 115/8 115/10 125/19

W

Walmart... [20] 125/20 125/23 126/3 126/7 126/20 128/1 128/15 132/13 132/25 133/5 133/13 133/23 136/11 136/13 136/23 138/23 139/24 141/3 142/10 145/3

Walmart's [5] 44/18 111/10 112/1 112/2 114/19

Walmarts [2] 125/12 127/23 want [36] 14/4 16/8 19/8 25/21 25/25 31/25 52/11 52/12 60/13 60/24 60/24 64/2 68/12 87/2 87/4 87/5 87/7 87/11 87/11 96/18 99/10 110/12 119/2 122/23 126/14 129/11 129/22 130/7 130/16 134/14 139/16 139/19 145/22 146/17 149/10 150/6

wanted [7] 16/4 17/24 22/1 22/15 24/13 78/14 110/8 wanting [2] 21/14 62/3 wants [3] 14/20 52/11 126/25 warehousing [1] 117/15 warning [1] 7/21 warranted [1] 80/9 warranting [1] 79/2 warrants [1] 69/15 Warren [2] 3/5 9/4 was [78]

Washington [9] 2/5 2/9 2/22 4/12 4/14 5/10 35/6 46/24 74/2 waste [2] 88/9 88/13 watching [2] 65/15 134/8 water [4] 7/17 7/17 51/5 137/15 Wawas [1] 120/20

way [26] 17/6 29/23 29/24 30/6 30/17 49/9 51/3 51/7 59/4 61/2 63/6 92/24 93/1 98/8 101/5 101/19 110/11 110/12 114/24

101/19 110/11 110/12 114/24 116/9 131/10 134/14 136/21 141/1 144/24 150/22

ways [6] 36/2 41/10 137/6 137/14 146/5 150/3

we [227]

we'd [1] 18/23

we'll [11] 7/23 11/17 13/4 13/9 65/10 82/22 88/11 101/3 102/2 140/9 151/5

we're [26] 12/8 14/1 16/19 22/16 24/18 25/9 30/23 96/2 96/4 96/18 97/7 100/23 102/5

102/10 103/2 105/8 107/4 107/11 115/6 120/17 120/17 120/18 121/24 128/11 150/24 151/3

we've [15] 12/6 14/22 31/13 80/2 85/19 88/6 113/16 133/12 136/10 137/3 138/18 143/20 145/6 146/8 149/7

Weber [2] 2/12 9/6 website [1] 52/14

week [16] 7/9 16/19 21/24 34/5 86/18 87/15 93/13 104/11 115/8 115/8 129/21 130/23 131/3 134/16 141/18 141/19

weekend [4] 11/2 12/13 12/15 31/15

weekly [1] 47/23 weeks [8] 39/24 59/11 61/7 88/19 89/7 99/7 118/24 128/16

weigh [1] 81/5 weighed [2] 64/18 65/5 weight [1] 79/17

Weil [5] 4/4 4/7 4/13 9/16 13/21 welcome [1] 25/24

well [42] 10/13 14/23 17/25 21/23 30/21 31/9 40/6 50/10 53/9 53/15 53/18 56/9 57/4 58/1 58/9 59/14 75/20 81/4 81/19 86/17 86/24 87/1 87/15 90/24 93/11 99/13 102/13 112/21 115/23 116/21 116/21 120/23 122/14 124/2 126/25 127/14 127/21 134/18 138/2 140/14 140/17 145/15

well-established [1] 116/21 well-known [2] 14/23 116/21 well-paying [1] 81/19 well-stocked [1] 145/15 went [2] 24/25 130/23 were [22] 11/12 17/25 21/14 22/1 22/11 28/14 30/2 30/19 38/10 79/6 89/1 89/2 92/14 97/14 120/25 128/22 132/6 135/12 139/5 141/14 149/17 149/25

weren't [2] 31/11 110/18 West [2] 37/15 91/3 whack [1] 103/2 what [116] what's [11] 28/21 44/1 47/20 53/8 103/15 104/3 114/5 116/6 116/6 122/17 135/20 **whatever [4]** 29/21 31/17 109/2 121/23

whatsoever [1] 97/3 Wheatley [2] 4/16 9/11 when [69] 16/23 23/9 23/25 26/3 34/18 37/25 39/7 40/22 42/20 43/22 45/3 47/11 49/17 49/21 52/11 57/14 58/20 59/16 61/22 69/13 80/25 83/12 84/15 84/24 86/16 87/1 87/2 87/3 87/6 87/8 87/20 96/17 97/10 103/5 105/23 106/22 107/4 108/8 110/13 110/14 111/17 112/6 113/7 113/11 113/16 116/13 120/17 121/1 121/12 122/5 122/6 122/6 122/11 122/12 122/12 126/9 126/23 127/3 130/9 130/22 131/11 132/11 132/13 132/16 136/16 137/19 137/24 146/17 147/2 where [60] 16/14 18/22 23/5 23/21 23/24 24/15 24/17 24/19 25/10 25/13 35/16 37/21 38/6 38/12 38/18 43/1 43/2 43/2 43/14 58/2 65/8 65/11 70/15 70/21 73/17 75/1 79/21 80/7

70/21 73/17 75/1 79/21 80/7 94/10 94/10 97/1 99/12 102/22 104/4 105/1 108/24 109/3 109/6 114/1 114/8 117/24 119/15 119/16 119/18 119/22 121/11 122/10 122/15 122/16 127/5 130/23 131/7 131/17 131/22 135/4 136/9 136/19 140/7 140/8 151/5 where's [1] 120/1

whereas [1] 117/2 wherewithal [1] 143/16 whether [26] 20/24 22/8 28/3 28/23 31/11 33/18 49/23 50/13 56/4 69/16 69/23 78/4 81/13 92/17 100/3 102/25 104/25 105/4 105/5 105/6 105/6 109/11 126/23 130/9 141/11 150/15 which [76] 11/6 12/12 14/11 18/25 18/25 20/9 20/16 21/8 23/6 23/6 23/11 23/20 23/21 27/3 27/10 27/12 30/23 35/16 38/14 38/19 43/25 44/7 44/11 45/2 45/16 46/17 47/14 47/15 49/9 49/20 50/7 51/21 54/14 56/3 57/4 57/6 58/1 58/13 65/11 68/22 69/16 70/7 70/10 71/14

W

which... [32] 74/4 74/10 76/9 76/25 76/25 77/12 81/24 89/11 91/23 98/5 101/12 103/6 103/21 108/4 112/19 115/4 115/24 116/6 116/9 122/20 125/22 125/23 129/3 129/8 130/3 135/22 138/18 139/1 140/13 140/23 147/2 149/9 whichever [1] 20/4 while [11] 7/23 12/20 22/6 60/25 64/6 65/15 68/8 88/12 89/9 96/14 108/8 whipsaw [5] 60/7 60/7 78/1 121/22 121/24 White [1] 105/22 whiteboard [1] 32/21 who [42] 26/3 30/20 30/23 31/1 33/9 48/9 50/9 56/1 80/24 83/18 86/17 88/17 105/15 105/16 105/18 105/18 111/3 130/2 130/7 130/11 130/11 130/16 131/17 133/25 134/8 134/15 134/19 137/4 138/6 139/19 141/5 142/10 145/2 145/18 145/18 145/19 146/2 148/9 148/14 149/4 149/16 149/22 who's [9] 15/23 92/5 93/14 94/6 94/16 107/6 111/4 135/16 141/18 who've [1] 32/7 whole [21] 21/9 51/13 58/13 59/7 74/16 76/5 77/7 87/2 89/19 102/15 104/6 106/2 107/9 127/22 129/9 130/10 130/17 130/19 132/16 147/19 150/11 wholesale [4] 68/13 72/8 75/16 92/18 wholesaler [2] 68/6 72/15 **wholesaling** [1] 72/19 whom [3] 68/2 94/23 128/20 whose [1] 99/25 why [20] 16/7 24/5 30/23 66/4 82/17 90/23 98/18 99/25 100/18 117/20 124/21 126/15 127/13 132/18 137/16 143/6 145/4 145/23 150/7 150/23 wide [1] 53/17

will [306]

Willams [1] 9/25

William [2] 3/23 8/20

Williams [2] 5/9 10/1

willing [3] 106/17 107/15 121/19 willingness [1] 106/14 win [4] 125/2 145/12 145/12 145/12 win-win-win [1] 145/12 window [2] 87/20 113/13 Winn [9] 28/8 68/13 68/15 73/3 93/11 93/14 93/18 98/9 134/25 Winn's [3] 28/18 29/8 68/17 Winn-Dixie [3] 93/11 98/9 134/25 winning [2] 47/17 52/10 wish [1] 132/6 wishes [1] 146/24 within [7] 52/23 67/5 83/13 84/23 108/25 112/1 112/2 without [10] 13/5 75/12 75/19 86/23 86/24 139/6 140/15 142/8 145/21 152/11 witness [9] 15/5 26/4 30/19 31/4 40/25 55/12 74/24 111/21 111/21 witnesses [34] 15/16 15/22 15/24 15/25 21/24 23/20 23/23 25/13 30/15 31/6 42/8 42/18 47/8 53/21 54/2 54/12 59/12 59/23 59/24 60/2 61/6 107/14 110/3 124/3 130/21 131/15 132/10 136/25 137/7 138/9 139/8 142/5 144/25 149/12 Wolf [13] 4/9 6/4 9/8 31/12 83/5 124/5 125/4 127/9 129/6 135/23 138/14 140/13 143/22 won't [13] 43/15 57/4 64/17 65/18 68/19 104/18 104/21 121/25 127/2 127/7 130/15 144/4 149/3 wonder [1] 140/12 wondered [1] 22/11 **Wonderful** [1] 33/2 word [7] 25/7 25/8 85/1 92/21 111/8 111/8 136/7 words [6] 42/16 43/18 45/22 106/16 110/16 112/14 work [16] 12/17 13/2 13/10 13/25 14/2 15/15 17/10 19/24 88/1 88/4 92/17 94/24 121/2 121/3 145/19 146/2 worked [2] 81/1 148/19 worker [1] 61/12 workers [20] 34/16 34/16 34/20

35/1 36/6 37/2 37/6 37/12 59/16 59/21 60/7 60/9 61/1 61/12 61/21 117/13 119/23 120/2 120/14 120/17 workforce [1] 120/9 working [10] 11/1 11/2 11/23 13/5 24/23 25/10 60/15 84/20 94/24 143/11 works [1] 83/24 world [21] 103/13 103/21 106/7 108/21 109/3 109/14 109/18 113/25 114/12 114/15 114/16 114/17 115/12 120/21 122/11 125/12 125/16 127/10 128/5 130/19 150/13 worldwide [1] 134/20 worried [1] 38/10 worry [1] 116/8 worrying [1] 89/6 worse [4] 60/25 141/14 141/15 141/15 worst [1] 68/2 **worthy [1]** 79/1 would [74] 14/24 15/13 15/15 15/19 15/20 17/6 17/7 18/2 18/5 18/9 19/9 19/20 20/4 21/22 23/14 24/24 27/5 27/22 28/17 29/12 29/15 29/15 29/17 29/21 30/24 32/5 34/23 34/24 37/8 37/11 54/21 57/1 58/3 61/19 61/25 62/5 66/22 67/2 67/2 67/3 71/4 79/22 80/12 81/16 85/4 85/4 90/21 90/21 92/15 115/4 119/19 119/23 120/1 121/1 121/3 121/13 121/19 122/21 125/2 126/23 128/22 133/18 133/25 137/22 138/8 139/18 139/19 141/12 141/12 141/14 145/25 149/5 150/12 151/4 wouldn't [1] 122/22 wrapping [1] 122/1 write [3] 38/6 39/7 39/23 writes [1] 65/16 wrong [6] 95/12 102/5 104/3 108/22 119/7 137/17 wrote [4] 38/11 65/23 80/24 131/23 **WY [1]** 3/24 **WYOMING [3]** 3/23 8/21 35/4 Y Yael [1] 9/14

Yael Cosset [1] 9/14 yeah [1] 25/18 year [27] 72/17 75/8 79/16 83/17 84/6 84/6 85/21 86/20 87/22 87/22 87/22 87/23 88/16 89/5 90/16 113/11 113/11 113/13 113/13 113/14 122/24 123/2 127/2 127/2 132/4 134/13 135/1 years [29] 33/24 43/7 73/23 74/13 75/5 76/5 76/11 79/9 85/13 87/20 88/14 90/6 91/14 113/8 128/8 130/25 132/5 134/1 134/9 134/21 134/23 135/2 135/11 139/13 139/22 142/7 143/11 148/18 148/24 Yeater [4] 63/17 63/18 64/1 64/16 yellow [2] 112/1 112/3 yes [18] 9/13 10/7 10/11 11/15 11/21 14/7 15/19 16/10 17/15 17/23 21/16 25/6 26/16 28/4 83/1 123/14 123/17 132/6 yet [4] 31/14 48/12 77/3 143/20 York [2] 4/8 104/10 Yost [1] 3/1 you [224] you'll [17] 43/22 44/9 44/11 86/18 86/25 95/21 107/13 108/23 109/23 115/1 130/17 138/19 139/8 140/13 141/22 143/19 147/1 **you're [42]** 15/17 18/25 25/7 25/24 54/22 55/6 87/15 88/19 89/6 90/4 92/4 92/18 93/13 93/18 93/22 94/14 94/21 95/1 95/22 97/10 98/7 99/16 103/16 104/21 106/8 106/22 108/15 111/2 111/3 115/19 115/19 116/8 116/20 118/2 119/9 131/15 135/15 139/3 139/25 141/17 143/10 147/22 you've [5] 95/20 108/18 108/18 119/11 127/8 Young [2] 3/23 8/21 your [209] Your Honor [80] Your Honor's [1] 86/19 Yulianny [1] 2/20

zealously [1] 79/24 zero [6] 88/9 88/9 118/17 118/17 118/18 118/20 zones [2] 118/17 118/17 zoom [8] 37/19 37/24 37/24 37/25 38/14 38/19 39/12 43/22 Zooming [1] 38/20